

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

ONE WISCONSIN INSTITUTE, INC.,
CITIZEN ACTION OF WISCONSIN EDUCATION
FUND, INC., RENEE M. GAGNER,
ANITA JOHNSON, CODY R. NELSON,
JENNIFER S. TASSE, SCOTT T. TRINDL, and
MICHAEL R. WILDER,

Plaintiffs,

-vs-

Case No. 15-cv-324-jdp

JUDGE GERALD C. NICHOL,
JUDGE ELSA LAMELAS,
JUDGE THOMAS BARLAND,
JUDGE HAROLD V. FROEHLICH,
JUDGE TIMOTHY VOCKE,
JUDGE JOHN FRANKE,
KEVIN J. KENNEDY, and MICHAEL HASS,
all in their official capacities,

Madison, Wisconsin
May 18, 2016
1:38 p.m.

Defendants.

TRANSCRIPT OF COURT TRIAL
AFTERNOON SESSION
HELD BEFORE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE JAMES D. PETERSON

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

Perkins Coie LLP
BY: JOSHUA KAUL
CHARLES CURTIS, JR.
BOBBIE WILSON
RHETT MARTIN
BRUCE SPIVA
1 East Main Street, Suite 201
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

Jennifer L. Dobbratz, RMR, CRR, CRC
U.S. District Court Federal Reporter
United States District Court
120 North Henry Street, Rm. 520
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
(608) 255-3821

For the Defendants:

Wisconsin Department of Justice
 BY: CLAYTON KAWSKI
 GABE JOHNSON-KARP
 JODY SCHMELZER
 SEAN MURPHY
 P.O. Box 7857
 Madison, Wisconsin 53707

Also appearing:

MATT KENNEDY, IT Specialist

INDEX OF WITNESSES

<u>PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS</u>	<u>EXAMINATION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
MARIBETH WITZEL-BEHL	Cross-Examination by Mr. Kowski	4
	Redirect Examination by Mr. Spiva	23
RENEE GAGNER	Direct Examination by Ms. Wilson	27
	Cross-Examination by Mr. Johnson-Karp	42
CARRIE SCHERPELZ	Direct Examination by Mr. Martin	47
	Cross Examination by Mr. Murphy	66
KENNETH MAYER	Direct Examination by Mr. Spiva	70

INDEX OF EXHIBITS

<u>PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBITS</u>	<u>IDENTIFIED</u>	<u>RECEIVED</u>
38 Report - Kenneth Mayer	71	73
43 Rebuttal Report - Kenneth Mayer	87	131
463 Chart	137	138
464 Chart	142	142
465 Chart	144	145
466 Chart	147	147

19

20

(Proceedings called to order at 1:38 p.m.)

21

THE COURT: Are we ready?

22

MR. KAWSKI: I think so, Your Honor.

23

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Before we start, I

24

have a question for you.

25

THE WITNESS: Yes.

1 THE COURT: If I understand the law correctly, despite
2 the fact that we have a 28-day residential duration
3 requirement --

4 THE WITNESS: Yes.

5 THE COURT: -- if a person has moved into the state
6 within that 28 days, so they haven't been a Wisconsin resident
7 for 28 days, they're still entitled to vote for president and
8 vice president. How do you handle that situation?

9 THE WITNESS: They would complete a voter registration
10 for after their 28-day residency is met, but they'd also
11 complete an application for a presidential ballot, and that's
12 not for the presidential primary; that's just for the
13 presidential election in November. And then we would give them
14 a sheet of paper with just the office of president and vice
15 president on it. They would mark that as their ballot, and then
16 two election officials would remake it onto an official ballot
17 so they'd only be voting for those offices, and the election
18 officials would feed the official ballot into the tabulator to
19 be counted.

20 THE COURT: Oh, okay. Because I was wondering whether
21 they had to prepare yet another ballot form for just voters in
22 that circumstance.

23 THE WITNESS: It's on an 8 1/2 x 11 sheet of paper.

24 THE COURT: You'd just print it up and Xerox it, and
25 you'd have it ready in case you needed one.

1 THE WITNESS: That's right.

2 THE COURT: Then the official ballot gets marked, and
3 you would only just mark the presidential --

4 THE WITNESS: That is right.

5 THE COURT: Okay. Good. Thank you.

6 Cross-examination.

7 CROSS-EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. KAWSKI:

9 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Witzel-Behl.

10 A Good afternoon.

11 Q How are you?

12 A Good.

13 Q You and I spoke at your deposition on April 22nd.

14 A Yes.

15 Q I am going to try and be brief and focused. It's going to
16 be difficult because I have notes from two days and an outline.

17 A Okay.

18 Q So if I'm looking down a lot, that's why.

19 A That's okay.

20 Q And I may refer to the deposition transcript at times.

21 Just so Mr. Spiva knows, it will be starting at page 43. That's
22 where I'd be starting when I get to those questions.

23 A Okay.

24 Q Mr. Spiva asked you some questions about poll workers being
25 confused about the forms of qualifying ID for voting, right?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And those poll workers are trained?

3 A Yes, they are.

4 Q And they're trained ultimately by the city.

5 A Yes.

6 Q And you're ultimately responsible for making sure they know
7 the forms of qualifying ID, correct?

8 A That's right.

9 Q So when they get it wrong, it's your fault?

10 A It's my responsibility to make sure that they don't make
11 that mistake again, yes.

12 Q Okay. So what types of steps do you take to make sure that
13 that's corrected if they do make mistakes?

14 A In Madison we require all of our election officials to
15 complete one hour of training before every election that they
16 work, and after an election I will take note of any problems
17 that I saw from the documentation prepared by the poll workers,
18 any complaints that I receive from voters, any feedback I
19 receive from the Government Accountability Board, and then I use
20 that to prepare the training for the next election. And after
21 the February primary, there were some complaints from voters who
22 thought that the poll workers took too long to figure out that
23 their nonexpiring military ID card was acceptable, and so we
24 really focused on that in our training for the April election,
25 and one of our voters who is a retired member of the military

1 provided us with examples of what each military ID card looks
2 like. There are many different looks, and they're not all
3 pictured on the infographic we have available from the state, so
4 we were able to spend time in training on looking at each of
5 those examples. That way the poll workers could become more
6 familiar with what they might be seeing at the polling place and
7 not have to check with the chief inspector before accepting one
8 of those as acceptable voter ID.

9 Q And you mentioned that you do use state materials to do
10 your training?

11 A Yes.

12 Q But ultimately it's not the state's responsibility to train
13 the City of Madison's poll workers, correct?

14 A That's right.

15 THE COURT: Does the state -- sorry to interrupt -- but
16 does the state GAB, I presume, mandate certain standards for the
17 training --

18 THE WITNESS: No.

19 THE COURT: -- or is it really left up to your
20 discretion to figure out what training is appropriate?

21 THE WITNESS: It's left up to our discretion, and there
22 are requirements for the number of hours that chief inspectors
23 must receive training for every two years, and then other than
24 that, the requirement is that the clerk needs to make sure that
25 the poll workers are trained. To administer that in the City of

1 Madison, we just have a requirement that all poll workers attend
2 one hour of training before every election that they work.
3 Because the law keeps changing, there are new things to go over,
4 and we want to review any trends that we saw in the last
5 election that they need to work on improving. So we're trying
6 to go for continual improvement. Other municipalities have just
7 training sessions for their chief inspectors and have their
8 chief inspectors train their poll workers where they have
9 training sessions that are three hours long once a year.

10 THE COURT: Thank you.

11 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

12 BY MR. KAWSKI:

13 Q You mentioned the training sessions, the one-hour training
14 session for the poll workers, right?

15 A That's right.

16 Q Just so the Court understands the difference between poll
17 workers and election inspectors, poll workers sit at the table
18 and do the check-ins and things like that?

19 A Poll workers are election inspectors, and, yes, they do sit
20 at the table and check in voters. Chief inspectors are also
21 election officials, but they attend a different training as a
22 group in the City of Madison, and that training syllabus we get
23 approved by the Government Accountability Board, so it counts
24 toward their recertification.

25 Q So the chief inspector is in charge of the other election

1 inspectors at a polling place?

2 A That's right.

3 Q And we talked in your deposition about when those one-hour
4 trainings take place, right?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And you mentioned how you do some of them on weekends?

7 A Yes, we do.

8 Q And given that there's no absentee voting on the weekend
9 anymore, you're now able to do those more easily or it doesn't
10 make a difference?

11 A It doesn't make a difference. It's the same offerings that
12 we've had in the past. We try to vary the days of week that we
13 offer training sessions, the time of day, and the locations in
14 Madison. Not everybody can reach the City-County Building
15 easily by bus. We'd prefer it if people wouldn't have to take a
16 bus with a transfer to get to training, and that's why we try to
17 have training sessions on the north side, the south side, east,
18 west, and downtown. And then the training sessions that are
19 held on the weekend are usually downtown because those are
20 spaces that are easiest for us to reserve, but then the
21 officials have to pay for parking when they come downtown to
22 take the training. So for some officials, that's not really a
23 good option.

24 Q And you talked about you have staff that work during the
25 in-person absentee period, correct?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And in the prior version of the law when weekend absentee
3 voting was permitted, they would be working on the weekend,
4 correct?

5 A That's right.

6 Q And now with no weekend in-person absentee voting, they
7 sometimes have to work on the weekend and sometimes they're able
8 to take time off, correct?

9 A That's right. What I do to prepare the training schedule
10 is ask for my staff's availability for overtime hours for the
11 weeks leading up to the election, and then when I have staff
12 available to work nights and weekends in addition to myself,
13 that gives me an option for another training session to be
14 offered.

15 Q Okay. Shifting topics, Mr. Spiva asked you about voting
16 lines for in-person absentee voting for the 2012 general
17 presidential election, right?

18 A Yes.

19 Q And you talked about lines kind of snarling around the
20 building and throughout your building, correct?

21 A The first floor of the building.

22 Q Okay. So the first floor of the building. But to be
23 clear, during that time weekend in-person absentee voting was
24 still allowed?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And what I would say is the hours were not limited yet at
2 that time, correct?

3 A That's right.

4 Q That didn't occur until 2014?

5 A I don't remember exactly when that change went into effect
6 in the law.

7 Q But it was not in effect for the 2012 presidential general?

8 A Right.

9 Q And you still had these lengthy lines?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Okay. When someone submits a copy of their ID card for
12 in-person absentee, you keep it on file, right?

13 A Not for in-person absentee. In-person absentee requires
14 that the voter present their ID, so we look at their ID. It's
15 when the voter requests that we mail them an absentee ballot
16 that we keep a copy of their ID on file.

17 Q Right, thank you. So when you receive a copy of that ID
18 and you keep it for 99 years --

19 A Yes.

20 Q -- if that person changes their registration, they don't
21 have to submit a copy of the ID again?

22 A If they change their -- if they reregister, then they're
23 supposed to submit another copy of their ID. How we catch that,
24 I'm not sure yet, but we'll figure that out with the WisVote
25 program.

1 Q Only if they have to change their registration do they have
2 to submit another copy of ID, correct?

3 A That's right.

4 Q Otherwise you have it on file already?

5 A That's right.

6 Q Okay. We talked in your deposition about what are the
7 bottlenecks for in-person absentee voting, and I asked you the
8 question, what are the two biggest bottlenecks for in-person
9 absentee voting, right?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Referring to starting at page 43 of your deposition, I
12 asked you what the number one bottleneck is, and you said --
13 tell me if I'm wrong, but I think I will read it here -- "The
14 slowness of the state's new voter registration system would be
15 the biggest bottleneck."

16 A Yes.

17 Q I said, "Okay." And I was trying to figure out what you
18 meant by that, a computer system, not any change in the law?

19 A Right. That's a new computer program that we have for
20 statewide voter registrations.

21 Q And the computer system was creating delays because of how
22 I think -- how it populated addresses of people when you entered
23 them or something?

24 A Right. I'm not an expert in any way on computer
25 technology, but when a voter registers and they're registering

1 at an address where somebody isn't currently also registered at
2 that address, we need to search for that address in the system,
3 and then if it's not out there as a possible address to just
4 validate them, we need to create that address in the system,
5 make sure that its placement is correct on a map that is shown
6 on the screen, make sure it has a district combination code and
7 then activate it, and then we can go on with the voter
8 registration, and the address portion is slower than my
9 patience.

10 Q And so this system is called WisVote?

11 A Yes.

12 Q And the slowness has nothing to do with the proof of
13 residency requirement per se?

14 A No. This is the computer system that we have to use.

15 Q And that was the number one bottleneck you identified for
16 in-person absentee voting?

17 A That's right. This past February into April election, that
18 was the one thing that slowed down our line of voters the most.

19 Q Okay. And then the number two bottleneck was the voter ID
20 law, correct?

21 A Right.

22 Q And specifically you talked about how voters might not
23 understand what IDs are acceptable?

24 A Right.

25 Q That they might not be clear when they go to the desk to

1 check in which ID is allowed?

2 A Right.

3 Q And I asked you, well, isn't there significant signage
4 around there; remember that?

5 A Yes.

6 Q You said sometimes people are on their phones or they're
7 reading a book, not paying attention to the signage?

8 A Yes.

9 Q There's really nothing you can do for someone who is not
10 paying attention, right?

11 A There is nothing that I could do without walking up and
12 talking to each voter, but as we talked about in the deposition,
13 I was answering the phone in the office.

14 Q That's just not reasonable to require you guys to walk up
15 to everyone and tell them what IDs are allowed?

16 A Right. Without enough people to do so.

17 Q We talked about the process of checking someone's ID, and
18 you testified that it takes about 40 seconds to do that?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And before Act 23, it took about 20 seconds to check
21 someone in, right?

22 A I don't know that I have timing on checking in at the
23 counter during absentee voting, but prior to the new
24 regulations, the voter would step up to the counter, give their
25 name and address, but there are other changes, as we talked

1 about, that had gone into place as well. Years ago the voter
2 also filled out a form that they would hand to us in addition.
3 So there have been numerous changes through the years; some that
4 would speed things up, and then others that did not.

5 Q And Act 23 created two main changes for the check-in
6 process, right? And those being showing qualifying ID and
7 signing the poll book?

8 A Are you still talking about in-person absentee voting --

9 Q No, I'm talking about election day.

10 A Oh, at the polls.

11 Q Yes.

12 A Yes. At the polls there's a requirement that you sign the
13 poll book as a voter, and prior to that you also show your ID.

14 Q Okay. And so, again, talking about at the polls on
15 election day --

16 A Yes.

17 Q -- you testified that now it takes 40 seconds about to
18 check someone in; is that right?

19 A It can take as few as 40 seconds. It can take about a
20 minute or over a minute. So we did some timing on this in
21 February at our polling places, and the fastest interactions
22 that we had at the poll book table were about 40 seconds. There
23 were others that it was over a minute.

24 Q Okay. And prior to that, again, it took about 20 seconds?
25 I think that's what you testified to.

1 A Yes.

2 Q Okay. And so I asked you could you break out how much time
3 was added by Act 23 in terms of signing the poll book added time
4 and checking ID added time; do you recall that?

5 A And I cannot break that out for you. When we did our mock
6 elections, we were doing the mock elections to figure out how to
7 implement the law while shortening the lines as much as
8 possible, and so we were looking at the law as a whole and not
9 breaking it out into signature versus showing ID.

10 Q So you can attribute of that extra added time how much of
11 it goes to showing and checking the ID, correct?

12 A No, because we did our timing as a whole, the whole
13 process.

14 Q So some of that time is obviously then attributed to the
15 signing the poll book part?

16 A Yes. That was part of the new law.

17 Q And that part can create slowdown as well because the poll
18 book is sort of upside down facing?

19 A Our experience is that the voter signing the poll book
20 upside down is not confusing. That works out fine. It probably
21 would be more disruptive for the poll workers to keep flipping
22 the poll book back and forth during the day, so signing the poll
23 book upside down actually is helpful for the poll workers. They
24 just move the poll book forward and then slide it back without
25 messing with the binding and having the poll book fall apart.

1 Q I guess what I meant is that the person's name is upside
2 down to the election official who is sitting there with the poll
3 book, right?

4 A The person's name and address are facing the poll worker.
5 The box where the voter signs is still facing the voter. The
6 voter just signs right within that box. The signature itself is
7 upside down to the poll worker. I don't know if that's what
8 you're referring to.

9 Q I'm just getting at do sometimes poll workers struggle
10 pointing out which box to sign in?

11 A Actually, the Government Accountability Board when they set
12 this up put numbers for each line, and so I haven't had any
13 feedback that the signature boxes are confusing at all.

14 Q Okay. But you have seen instances where people have signed
15 in the wrong box, correct?

16 A We have.

17 Q How frequent does that happen?

18 A Every so often, and we tell the poll workers to document
19 that on their inspector statement. If they notice that, they
20 just make note of it. They don't need to call the voter at home
21 and have them come back into the polling place.

22 Q You talked to Mr. Spiva about provisional ballots?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And you said that for the April 2016 election, there were
25 123 provisional ballots issued for voter ID reasons in Madison?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And I asked you at your deposition what were the total
3 number of ballots cast in Madison; do you remember that?

4 A Yes.

5 Q How many was it?

6 A It was over 118,000.

7 Q So --

8 A And that's for April.

9 Q Right, just for April. I'm not asking you to do the math
10 on the stand, but I did do the math, and that's .1 percent of
11 all ballots cast were provisional.

12 A Yes. For the campus wards it was .14 percent.

13 Q Okay. So you did do the math?

14 A Yes, but I couldn't have come up with that up here on the
15 stand. I didn't do the math right now.

16 Q Okay. How many provisional ballots did you order for the
17 April 2016 election?

18 A A provisional ballot isn't a separate print job. It's a
19 regular ballot. On the back of the ballot, the poll workers
20 write the provisional voter number, and there's a stamp we give
21 them to stamp the relevant section of the state statute. So
22 it's not that we print separate provisional ballots. We also
23 send about 20 provisional envelopes to each polling place that
24 they have available that they could use for any election.
25 They're not election-specific.

1 Q So for each polling place they had a total of 20 envelopes?

2 A They did.

3 Q And you said there were 87 polling places?

4 A That's right.

5 Q So how many total envelopes about did you prepare for
6 provisional ballot purposes?

7 A In addition to those that we sent to the polling places, we
8 have thousands and thousands in our office printed when voter ID
9 first went into effect. So I don't remember how many we printed
10 at that time, but we're still using those envelopes.

11 Q And so you sent 20 to each polling place, and they didn't
12 use them all?

13 A That's right.

14 Q And, you know, doing quick math, you sent out about 1,600
15 provisional envelopes?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Would it be fair to say you were anticipating at least
18 1,600 provisional ballots?

19 A No.

20 Q No. Okay. Here is where we get to my notes, and it's
21 going to be a lot of miscellaneous, I think.

22 A That's fine.

23 Q You talked about election observers with Mr. Spiva?

24 A Yes.

25 Q And I just want to be clear that when you're talking about

1 the blue tape area where they stand, that that is an area that
2 election inspectors, the chief inspector, can order the
3 observers to stand in that area?

4 A That's right.

5 Q And that is not a change in the law, right?

6 A A few years ago there was a change in the Government
7 Accountability Board rules for observers to actually have a
8 brochure that is handed to the observer with all the rules
9 spelled out.

10 Q I guess what I mean is the chief inspector could always
11 order the observers to stand in a certain spot?

12 A Yes, have a designated area for the observers. A few years
13 ago we started designating that with blue painter's tape on
14 election morning because feedback from the poll workers was that
15 the observer area tended to move itself forward during the day,
16 so that was our solution.

17 Q Okay. And it's always been the case that the chief
18 election inspector could order a misbehaving observer out of the
19 polling place?

20 A That's right.

21 Q You talked in your direct exam about taking pictures at the
22 polling place and zooming in with a cell phone?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Cameras are not allowed for observers, correct?

25 A The observers can't take pictures during voting hours.

1 They could take pictures as the polls are being closed after
2 voting is complete. They are allowed to use their cell phones
3 during the day while voting is taking place, but not take
4 pictures unless they're a member of the media.

5 Q So a nonmedia election observer who is on their cell phone
6 zooming in, what do you do with that?

7 A Well, the question that came up to me from a number of
8 chief inspectors was that they were concerned about when
9 observers are holding up their phone, whether they're zooming in
10 to see personal information, and so I have told them they need
11 to walk by behind the observers to see exactly what's taking
12 place.

13 Q But that could, I guess, be construed as using the cell
14 phone inappropriately for camera purposes?

15 A If they're taking a picture. If they're not taking a
16 picture, they're allowed to use the cell phone in the polling
17 place, and sometimes they're texting or they're checking
18 something on the internet, and that's perfectly fine.

19 THE COURT: So you're saying they're using it more like
20 a binoculars instead of a camera. They're not taking the
21 photograph, but they're using the zoom feature to get a closer
22 look.

23 THE WITNESS: Right. That's the concern that's been
24 brought up to me by some chief inspectors.

25 THE COURT: Okay. So could you sanction or discipline

1 or control an observer for that behavior?

2 THE WITNESS: The observers would have to catch them
3 doing that, and then first we'd try to just talk to the observer
4 and tell them that that's personal, confidential information
5 that can't be disclosed and they can't do that, and then if they
6 were to do it again, they'd be told to leave the polling place.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 BY MR. KAWSKI:

9 Q You talked about different proof of residence documents,
10 right?

11 A Right.

12 Q And in March of 2016 a new document was added to that list
13 which isn't -- what is it?

14 A It's an intake document for a care facility. So assisted
15 living or a nursing home wouldn't necessarily have a lease with
16 their residents, but they would do a contract or some sort of an
17 intake document when somebody moves in, and that could be used
18 to prove an address.

19 Q And that was an addition that the Wisconsin legislature
20 made to the law?

21 A That's right.

22 Q And what population would that assist?

23 A Those who are living in care facilities. So it might be a
24 nursing home or assisted living facility or CBRF facility.

25 Q And is that a population you would have potentially seen

1 using the corroboration option in the past?

2 A Not necessarily. They in the past probably would have
3 registered during open registration and not given a document.
4 In the past we had seen more married couples using the
5 corroboration option.

6 Q Okay. You talked about the -- and I don't remember -- it's
7 the certified housing list for students and the issue of
8 confirming citizenship, correct?

9 A Right.

10 Q It's not that students have to use that certified housing
11 list to prove their residency, correct?

12 A No. They could use any document on the list of acceptable
13 documents.

14 Q You talked about sending absentee ballots overseas?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And the complications that can create?

17 A Right.

18 Q I'm wondering, have you ever sent a ballot using a
19 commercial carrier?

20 A No, we do not. We use U.S. mail.

21 Q Okay. And why do you use U.S. mail only?

22 A Because that is what we are able to use through our mail
23 room. We take the tray of absentees down to the mail room.
24 They are able to seal those envelopes for us saving us paper
25 clips -- or paper cuts on our tongues, and then they also will

1 put the postage on and get it to the post office for us, so we
2 don't have to deal with any of that administration.

3 Q The reason I ask is Mr. Spiva asked you whether it would be
4 impossible to get certain people a ballot in time, and as I was
5 sitting here, I went online and put in DHL for Ecuador and DHL
6 for -- the other country was -- Ecuador is the one I remember.
7 Do you acknowledge that a commercial carrier like DHL can
8 deliver to countries like Ecuador?

9 A I have no information on DHL. We'd have to get special
10 permission from the finance department if we were to use a
11 service other than what we have available through our payment
12 options with the county.

13 Q You would acknowledge though that it may be possible to get
14 a ballot to a voter in another country using a commercial
15 carrier?

16 A It may be.

17 MR. KAWSKI: Okay. I have no further questions.

18 THE COURT: Any redirect?

19 MR. SPIVA: Just a couple, Your Honor.

20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. SPIVA:

22 Q You probably haven't done the comparison, but would e-mail
23 be cheaper than DHL to send the ballots overseas?

24 A We have no postage costs on e-mail.

25 Q Okay. And what impact on costs do you think it would have

1 if you were sending international -- absentee ballots
2 internationally through commercial carriers?

3 A I have no idea.

4 Q You were asked some questions about the observers?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And you mentioned that people were using, I guess, the
7 cameras, or the phones rather, as binoculars?

8 A Yes.

9 Q If someone were to snap a picture even though they're not
10 supposed to, would there be a way to necessarily tell that they
11 were doing that unless somebody was standing right behind them?

12 A I don't know. It would, I guess, depend on the cell phone
13 that they're using. My cell phone sometimes lets off a flash;
14 sometimes it doesn't. So I don't know.

15 Q And if they were taking a video, would there be a way to
16 tell that unless somebody was standing behind them?

17 A I don't know of a way to tell unless you're standing behind
18 the observer.

19 Q And then you were asked some questions about, you know,
20 whether it was your responsibility to do certain training.
21 Probably an obvious question, but the voter ID law is a state
22 law, correct?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And you didn't have a need to do any training on voter ID
25 before the voter ID law was passed by the state, I take it?

1 A No. We did training every election since I became clerk.
2 I have required all officials to attend training every election,
3 and it would be on whatever we have determined that they need
4 the most work on to improve.

5 Q And does the state have some responsibility for training
6 the clerk of the city?

7 A The state does provide webinars that we watch, and they
8 offer those pretty frequently -- I'd say at least once a
9 month -- and then we try to catch when they're going to be held
10 to watch and find out if they have any new guidance for us, and
11 then we'll include that information in the training that we do
12 for our local officials.

13 Q Do they have any oversight responsibilities, say, over you,
14 GAB, since it's still in existence? Is there some kind of
15 oversight responsibility over the localities, the locality
16 clerks?

17 A They give us direction on how to do things and guidance.
18 They also provide that guidance and direction to the county
19 clerks.

20 Q And is that guidance -- is some of that guidance binding in
21 that it's mandatory?

22 A They do have rules that we need to follow, yes.

23 Q And does the state have responsibility for implementing at
24 least state and federal elections?

25 A Yes. They are the ones who certify the elections in the

1 end, and we are required as municipalities to report certain
2 information to them within a deadline after each election.

3 MR. SPIVA: Thank you very much. I don't have any
4 further questions.

5 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

6 THE COURT: Just one quick follow-up. Before the
7 change that eliminated the weekend voting, there still was a
8 window within which you could do in-person absentee voting?

9 THE WITNESS: Before they --

10 THE COURT: Before they eliminated the weekend voting
11 and then set the parameters for your weekday hours that you
12 could --

13 THE WITNESS: Right. We could have in-person absentee
14 voting once we had ballots in the office, and then that would
15 end the day before election day.

16 THE COURT: Okay. So could you -- was it totally
17 within your discretion to set whatever hours you thought were
18 appropriate?

19 THE WITNESS: Yes. And then we would publish those
20 hours in the newspaper.

21 THE COURT: So you could do 24/7 if you wanted to --

22 THE WITNESS: We could.

23 THE COURT: -- before that. Okay. Thanks.

24 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

25 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. You get the

1 endurance prize so far. I hope your record stands unchallenged.

2 (Witness excused at 2:10 p.m.)

3 THE COURT: Okay. Next witness.

4 MR. SPIVA: Your Honor, plaintiffs call Renee Gagner.

5 **RENEE GAGNER, PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS, SWORN,**

6 DIRECT EXAMINATION

7 BY MS. WILSON:

8 Q Good afternoon.

9 A Good afternoon.

10 Q Would you please state your name and spell your name for
11 the record?

12 THE COURT: Ms. Wilson, would you turn your mic just a
13 little bit toward you? Thanks.

14 THE WITNESS: Renee Gagner, R-E-N-E-E G-A-G-N-E-R.

15 BY MS. WILSON:

16 Q And you're one of the plaintiffs in this case, right?

17 A Yes.

18 Q And how old are you?

19 A 23.

20 Q And where do you live?

21 A I live in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

22 Q And how long have you lived there?

23 A I have lived there for a little over a year, since late
24 March of 2015.

25 Q And where do you work?

1 A I work for SEIU Healthcare Wisconsin.

2 Q And what is SEIU?

3 A The Service Employees International Union.

4 Q And what do you do for them there?

5 A I am a staff representative/organizer.

6 Q And are you also a recent college graduate?

7 A Yes. I graduated in 2014.

8 Q And where did you go to school?

9 A Beloit College.

10 Q And is Beloit a private school, state school? What kind of
11 school is it?

12 A It's a private liberal arts school.

13 Q And what was your degree in?

14 A I had a Bachelor of Arts in political science and
15 psychology.

16 Q And did you study election law in political science?

17 A I did study it a little bit though I think my interaction
18 with it was more doing some student organizing on campus than in
19 my coursework.

20 Q Okay. We'll talk about that in just a minute. Are you a
21 voter?

22 A I am.

23 Q And how long have you voted?

24 A I have been voting since I was 18, which was the fall
25 election in 2010.

1 Q And did you vote in the last election?

2 A I did.

3 Q And when was that?

4 A That was in early April of this year.

5 Q And why do you vote?

6 A I vote because I think it's very important to be involved
7 in the political process. Our elected officials influence a lot
8 of aspects of our everyday lives.

9 Q And where did you live when you were in school?

10 A I lived in the dorms on campus.

11 Q And were you in the dorms the whole four years?

12 A With the exception of a semester being abroad, yes.

13 Q And did you have one sort of single address because you
14 lived at the school or did you have different addresses over the
15 years?

16 A Each dorm building was considered a separate -- sort of a
17 separate address. We were all under 700 College Street as the
18 college's address, but each dorm building was kind of its own
19 address, and we would need to reregister when we moved
20 buildings.

21 Q So you registered when you were 18 to vote, right?

22 A Yes.

23 Q And do you remember the address you used?

24 A 700 College Street, Aldrich Hall, Beloit, Wisconsin 53511.

25 Q Okay. That's very good.

1 A Thanks.

2 Q I actually meant did you register at school or at home?

3 A At school, yes.

4 Q And so how many times when you were at school did you have
5 to register or reregister?

6 A I had to reregister if I were home in the summer and there
7 were elections in the summer, which did happen at least two
8 summers, I believe. I would reregister at home if I had been
9 there for more than whatever the residency requirement was at
10 the time, and even if I didn't reregister at home during the
11 summer, I would need to reregister if I had moved to a new
12 building on campus in the fall.

13 Q And did having to register and reregister, did that have
14 any impact on you as far as your voting went?

15 A I was always able to do it and, you know, this is
16 something that I'm pretty passionate about, so I made sure that
17 I was able to reregister and made plans to do so, but it was
18 more work than, you know, it would have been if we had just
19 voted under the same address across campus.

20 Q And did you have other students, college students of yours
21 that had the same issue in terms of registering and then having
22 to reregister?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Now, do you have a preferred way of voting that you like to
25 vote?

1 A I prefer to vote in-person absentee.

2 Q And why do you prefer to vote in-person absentee?

3 A I'm often busy on election day either encouraging and
4 helping others to vote or just work or in class and doing my
5 normal day-to-day activities.

6 Q And when you voted in-person absentee, did you ever vote on
7 the weekends?

8 A I don't recall ever voting on the weekends.

9 Q So you know there's been a change, that the weekends have
10 been eliminated, right?

11 A Yes.

12 Q So that's not going to have any impact on you at all
13 because you never voted on the weekends?

14 A It does have an impact on me.

15 Q How so?

16 A Even though I never used it when I was a student because my
17 schedule did allow me to go and vote on a weekday during
18 business hours where I maybe had an hour or two hours in between
19 classes to do that, I now work during business hours and
20 sometimes even longer than that, and it's a lot more difficult
21 for me to, you know, get down to early vote during that time.

22 Q We talked a little bit about your major.

23 A Uh-huh.

24 Q But do you feel like you're familiar with Wisconsin's
25 voting laws?

1 A Yes, I would say so.

2 Q And how is it that you're familiar with them?

3 A I became familiar with them primarily through helping other
4 students to vote when I was on campus.

5 Q And what kinds of activities did you do to help other
6 students to vote?

7 A So I sort of worked to -- along with some of my peers to
8 educate students about voting, make sure they knew what was on
9 the ballot and when the elections were as well as what they
10 needed at the polls, if anything, and where to go vote.

11 Q And how did you do that? Did you just -- did you volunteer
12 somewhere? How did you do that?

13 A I did that primarily through the College Democrats in
14 Beloit.

15 Q And what is the College Democrats?

16 A It's an organization that, you know, it was at least
17 partially affiliated with the state party and works to support
18 and elect Democratic candidates, but we also did have a focus on
19 just more general voter education, so if we were talking to
20 someone about the election and they were a Republican, we would,
21 you know, still tell them when and where to go vote.

22 Q Okay. Would you also register voters as part of the
23 College Democrats?

24 A Yes. Some of us were Special Registration Deputies.

25 Q And when did you -- were you a Special Registration Deputy?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And when did you become a Special Registration Deputy?

3 A I do not exactly recall, but I believe it would have been
4 sometime around the spring of -- actually I'm not sure. Either
5 in 2011 or 2012.

6 Q And in what area were you a Special Registration Deputy?

7 A I was a Special Registration Deputy in the City of Beloit
8 and the City of Milwaukee.

9 Q And were you a special deputy in your hometown?

10 A No.

11 Q And why not?

12 A So I had initially tried to become a Special Registration
13 Deputy when living in my hometown in 2008, and that was when one
14 could still become a statewide deputy, and at that time I was
15 not 18 so I was not allowed to do it. And then later on I would
16 have liked to become a Special Registration Deputy for the City
17 of Waukesha, but the clerk really did not provide trainings for
18 people to be able to do that.

19 Q And you can't be a Special Registration Deputy without the
20 training?

21 A Yes.

22 Q And are you currently a Special Registration Deputy?

23 A No, but I would like to be.

24 Q And what's preventing you from being one?

25 A I need to arrange my schedule to attend a training again.

1 Q Okay. Now, did you do any other activities when you were
2 in college to help people to vote?

3 A Well, as a Special Registration Deputy, I did a lot of
4 voter registration. I also worked with the College Democrats
5 and with other organizations on campus to make sure that
6 students knew where our polling location was, that they knew
7 when the elections were, what was on the ballot, and things of
8 that nature.

9 Q And how would the College Democrats go about finding
10 students or directing them?

11 A We would try to reach them in a variety of ways. So we
12 would hang flyers around campus, and we would use kind of an
13 online bulletin board that we had access to. We would sometimes
14 just sort of do what's called tabling, so stand outside at a
15 table outside of the cafeteria and talk to students coming in
16 and out or, you know, even talk to students in another location
17 on campus. And then we would do what's called dorm storming the
18 night before each election where we would put flyers either on
19 or under the doors of all the dorm rooms on campus and then sort
20 of draw chalk arrows toward the polling location to guide
21 students there.

22 Q Literally chalk on the ground?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Okay. What was your experience when you were working to
25 help students to vote and to register them?

1 A My experience was that students were definitely interested
2 in registering and voting, but they were kind of confused by the
3 process. We did have a large number of students who did not
4 grow up in the State of Wisconsin, and obviously voting in, you
5 know, Oregon or even Illinois is going to be different than
6 voting here in Wisconsin. So it took a lot of work to make sure
7 that they were informed about the process.

8 Q Okay. And did you -- were you ever involved in being an
9 observer or a poll watcher?

10 A I was an observer and kind of led a team of observers in a
11 special election in the summer of 2011.

12 Q And that was while you were still in school?

13 A Yes, but that was not in Beloit. That was in the greater
14 Milwaukee area.

15 Q Okay. And why did you do observing?

16 A I did observing partially because it was just part of the
17 job I was doing at the time, but I think the reason that our
18 organization was doing observing was, for one, just to sort of
19 see how the turnout was looking in some targeted areas to make
20 sure that we were, you know, getting voters out to the polls in
21 those areas and also because we had heard of some concerns,
22 especially with all the changing laws, and wanted to make sure
23 that everybody was being given good information about voting
24 when they went to go vote.

25 Q Now, you said it was through the job that you had. What

1 job was that?

2 A I was working for We Are Wisconsin.

3 Q Okay. And what is We Are Wisconsin?

4 A It's an organization kind of made up of I think various
5 labor unions and sort of other progressive groups who were
6 coming together to work on some of the recall elections in
7 Wisconsin.

8 Q Okay. And when -- you talked about problems that you had
9 heard of because of the changing laws. Can you tell me a little
10 bit more about that?

11 A I think, and I don't recall exactly, you know, what
12 anecdotes we were told about, but we had heard that there was
13 just more confusion going on because there had been so many
14 changes to the law in such a short period of time and that we
15 wanted to make sure that that confusion was not preventing
16 people from voting.

17 Q That actually reminds me of a question I should have asked
18 you a little earlier. When you were working with the students,
19 did you find that they were confused about the -- how to
20 register?

21 A I think a little bit. Because we were SRDs, it was easy
22 for us to walk them through that process very directly by
23 actually sitting down and filling out the form with them or, you
24 know, walking them through that form, so I think it would have
25 been much more confusing for them if they did not have access to

1 SRDs.

2 Q You said you voted at 18, right?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And the first time you voted, did you have to show a photo
5 ID?

6 A No.

7 Q But at some point that changed, right?

8 A Yes.

9 Q And then you had to show a photo ID?

10 A Yes.

11 Q How did you feel about that?

12 A I felt a little frustrated about it, so, you know, even
13 though I do have access to a photo ID because I do have a
14 driver's license, which I know is not the case for everybody,
15 you know, I had previously been able to vote with my signature.
16 And, you know, I filled out a form with my legal information,
17 including my Social Security number, and signed off on that
18 form, and then went and signed off that I was who I was and the
19 state believed me, and I don't see any reason for that to
20 change.

21 Q But what about that photo ID makes -- it gives more
22 integrity to the system?

23 A I don't think it really does. I don't think there was any
24 issue with the integrity of the system before the photo ID law
25 was in place, and I think the most integral part of the

1 integrity of the system is making sure that everyone has access
2 to voting.

3 Q Okay. Now, you said that you were an observer. That was
4 in Milwaukee, right?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Okay. And did you have an opportunity to observe any
7 issues with observers while you were being an observer in
8 Milwaukee?

9 A So the one issue that we ran into -- I did not witness the
10 full problem. This is when I was kind of supervising a group of
11 observers, but we had a polling location in sort of a heavily
12 African-American part of Milwaukee way in the northwest corner,
13 and I was called in to sort of assist because at this location
14 there was a person there, I don't know who she was or what
15 organization she was from, but she was kind of standing in the
16 lobby of the building and telling voters that they needed ID,
17 and we wanted to make sure that that did not continue because
18 the voter ID law was not in effect at that time.

19 Q So what did you do?

20 A So I talked to the volunteers who were there and made sure
21 that they were speaking to the poll workers at the location to
22 address it, and then I also went over there just to assist them
23 in that, and I think the woman who was there had left -- ended
24 up leaving shortly after I arrived, so I didn't see her
25 interacting with any voters, but I did see her there.

1 Q Okay. Has there ever been a time when you wanted to vote
2 but you were unable to vote?

3 A Yes.

4 Q I'm not talking about the time when -- before you were 18.

5 A So in the spring of 2013, I studied abroad that semester,
6 and I had ordered or, you know, requested an absentee ballot to
7 be sent to my parents' house because I wasn't really sure, you
8 know, what the situation would be like when I got over there. I
9 don't think I was told my address until I arrived in Austria, so
10 I couldn't really make arrangements before I went over there to
11 have a ballot sent directly to me. So I did ask my parents to
12 send that to me once it was at their house, and it did not
13 arrive to me until a few days after the election.

14 Q And how did you feel about that?

15 A I was a little frustrated. It was a spring election. It
16 was, you know, not one of the big, flashy elections, but I still
17 like to make sure that I can vote in every election.

18 Q And is there anything that you think that could have been
19 in place that might have helped in that situation?

20 A I think if I had access to vote by e-mail or, you know, in
21 another digital format, that that would have helped me.

22 Q Okay. Have you ever used the mail-in absentee ballot?

23 A Yes.

24 Q And when did you -- was that the time you just told us
25 about, Austria?

1 A There were a couple of other times as well. So I did use
2 it -- so after I first graduated college, I was working a job
3 temporarily in another state, down in Arkansas for about six or
4 seven months, and at that time I did have an absentee ballot
5 mailed to my address down there and did fill that out and sent
6 it back to Wisconsin. And then in last spring, so the spring of
7 2015, when I moved to Milwaukee from Waukesha, I had not been
8 living in the city for the full 28 days when the election rolled
9 around, so I did need to still vote at my parents' address in
10 Waukesha and did use a mail-in absentee ballot to do that.

11 Q So the residency requirement change, that impacted you?

12 A Yes. If it had stayed at I believe it used to be ten days,
13 I would have been able to vote in Milwaukee.

14 Q But you were still able to vote, right?

15 A Yes.

16 Q And did you have any issues with using the mail-in ballot?

17 A It took a little bit longer I think than if I had just been
18 able to vote in-person absentee in Milwaukee because I did need
19 to gain access to a printer to actually print the form to
20 request that ballot, and then, you know, take a small amount of
21 extra time to mail that in. I wouldn't say it was a significant
22 impact but a slight one.

23 Q And so why don't you use the mail-in ballot all the time?

24 A I prefer to go in in person and make sure that my ballot
25 gets there, first of all, since I can actually see it being

1 handed to the clerk. Yeah, so I honestly just prefer that, and
2 it's easier for me to go in in person than to try to print the
3 form and continue to request a ballot each time.

4 Q So might be obvious because you work for the College of
5 Democrats, but you're a Democrat, right?

6 A Yes.

7 Q And you've also done some work, not just voter
8 registration, poll watching, but you've worked for some
9 campaigns, right?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Okay. There's been a change in straight-ticket voting.
12 You understand that, right?

13 A Uh-huh.

14 Q And has that had any impact on you in any way?

15 A I did straight-ticket vote when it was available to me,
16 which I believe was only the fall election in 2010, and I would
17 continue to do that if it was accessible to me. And I think
18 just beyond me personally, it's much easier when I'm helping a
19 voter who, you know, doesn't read about elections quite as much
20 as I do, when I'm assisting them in sort of preparing to go to
21 the polls, you know, if I can just tell them, you know, if they
22 tell me they want to vote Democrat, I can tell them, that's
23 great; there is a box you can check for that. That's much
24 easier than having to assist them in making sure that they know
25 all of the elections to look for on what can be a confusing

1 ballot.

2 MS. WILSON: Okay. Thank you very much.

3 THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

4 THE COURT: Cross-examination.

5 CROSS-EXAMINATION

6 BY MR. JOHNSON-KARP:

7 Q Good afternoon, Miss Gagner. My name is Gabe Johnson-Karp.
8 You mentioned that it was not a significant impact when you had
9 to mail -- use an absentee by mail; is that correct?

10 A For me personally, yes. I do have access to a printer at
11 work, and my employer did allow me to print out that form, but I
12 do understand that for people who don't necessarily have that
13 access, it may be a greater impact to have to either go
14 somewhere to find a printer or pay to use one.

15 Q But for you not a significant impact?

16 A No. I wouldn't say that.

17 Q Are you aware you can e-mail or fax a request for an
18 absentee ballot?

19 A I was not aware of that.

20 Q And are you aware that you can write to your clerk to
21 confirm whether your ballot was received?

22 A I also was not aware of that actually. Though I do know
23 that you can access that online.

24 Q You're aware of the My Vote website?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And you can confirm whether your ballot was received?

2 A Uh-huh.

3 Q Or whether it was sent to you?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Okay. And you mentioned straight-ticket voting. The
6 elimination of straight-ticket voting hasn't prevented you from
7 voting, has it?

8 A No, it hasn't prevented me from voting, but I don't see any
9 reason for it to happen.

10 Q And you've still been able to vote for the candidates of
11 your choice?

12 A Yes.

13 Q You've still been able to locate the candidates of your
14 choice on the ballot?

15 A Yes.

16 Q You mentioned being a Special Registration Deputy; is that
17 correct?

18 A Uh-huh.

19 Q You are a Special Registration Deputy in Milwaukee right
20 now?

21 A I am not currently, but I would like to be.

22 Q Okay. And you've taken the certification in the past?

23 A Yes, both in Beloit and Milwaukee.

24 Q And you've been able to complete that?

25 A Yes.

1 Q And you would like to be a deputy in other municipalities?

2 A I would primarily like to be a deputy in Milwaukee again,
3 but I do in my work travel to different municipalities
4 throughout the state and would like to be deputized in those as
5 well.

6 Q And you mentioned that the clerk in Waukesha has made it
7 difficult to become a Special Registration Deputy; is that
8 correct?

9 A Yes. I don't believe there are any Special Registration
10 Deputy trainings offered in the City of Waukesha, at least not
11 when I lived there.

12 Q Other than Waukesha, is anything preventing you from
13 becoming a Special Registration Deputy for another municipality?

14 A I think time is. You know, kind of depends on how many
15 municipalities I'm looking to be a Special Registration Deputy
16 in, but it does take much more time for me to go to each
17 municipality, find a training that works with my work schedule,
18 and attend that training versus just being deputized for the
19 whole state.

20 Q But it's your time, correct? Nobody is preventing you
21 from -- nobody has taken any steps to prevent you from being a
22 Special Registration Deputy?

23 A Except making it more difficult with my schedule, yes.

24 Q You mentioned you have done work registering college
25 students; is that correct?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And that was before you graduated in 2014?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And during your time in college, the voter ID law was only
5 in effect for one election; is that correct?

6 A I believe so.

7 Q That would have been the February 2012 election?

8 A Yes, that sounds right.

9 Q And other than that election, students weren't required to
10 show an ID to vote?

11 A No. Though I do remember, because the law was kind of
12 going back and forth whether it was in effect or not, that we
13 were dealing with helping students to get IDs in case they would
14 need them for future elections.

15 Q But during that period they weren't required to show an ID
16 other than the February 2012?

17 A I believe that's correct.

18 Q Okay. And you believe that the voter ID requirement
19 imposes one obstacle too many for college students?

20 A Yes, I do.

21 Q Are you aware of the amount of time that college students
22 on average spend on social media?

23 A I couldn't give you a number, no.

24 Q You said you do have a valid Act 23-compliant ID, correct?

25 A Yes, I have a driver's license.

1 Q Do you have a passport?

2 A I do.

3 Q Any other compliant IDs?

4 A Not that I am aware of.

5 Q And you are registered in Milwaukee?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Just briefly like to discuss that instance I think you
8 mentioned on the north side of Milwaukee?

9 A Uh-huh.

10 Q Somebody was telling people that an ID was required when it
11 wasn't required?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Do you recall which election that was?

14 A That was the 8th Senate District recall election which was
15 in the summer of 2011. It was a special election.

16 Q Okay. And as far as you know, the person telling people
17 that they needed an ID wasn't a member of the Government
18 Accountability Board, was it?

19 A No.

20 Q As far as you know, it wasn't a state employee?

21 A As far as I'm aware, it was not.

22 Q As far as you know, it was a private citizen?

23 A As far as I'm aware, yes.

24 MR. JOHNSON-KARP: No further questions. Thank you.

25 THE COURT: Any redirect?

1 MS. WILSON: No, Your Honor.

2 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Gagner.

3 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

4 (Witness excused at 2:35 p.m.)

5 MR. SPIVA: Your Honor, our next witness is Carrie
6 Scherpelz.

7 **CARRIE SCHERPELZ, PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS, SWORN,**

8 DIRECT EXAMINATION

9 BY MR. MARTIN:

10 Q Good afternoon, Miss Scherpelz.

11 A Hello.

12 Q Would you please state your name and spell it for the
13 record.

14 A Carrie Scherpelz, C-A-R-R-I-E S-C-H-E-R-P-E-L-Z.

15 Q Thank you. Ms. Scherpelz, could you tell me where you were
16 born and where you grew up?

17 A I grew up in Oak Park, Illinois, and grew up in Illinois,
18 moved to Wisconsin in 1978.

19 Q Okay. And where did you go to college?

20 A University of Illinois.

21 Q Okay. And what do you do for a living?

22 A I'm a freelance marketing communication expert.

23 Q Okay.

24 A I work from home.

25 Q Okay. And do you also work and volunteer your time on

1 election voting-related activities?

2 A Yes.

3 Q And how do you do that?

4 A I have worked as a Special Registration Deputy. I have
5 worked at the city clerk's office as a volunteer during early
6 absentee voting, and I began working in 2013 at my own polling
7 place as a poll worker.

8 Q Okay. And let's talk a bit about your work as a Special
9 Registration Deputy. When did you start doing that work?

10 A It was sometime in early 2012.

11 Q Okay. And was that a statewide registration deputy or was
12 that a city specific?

13 A So whatever date it started, I was not able -- the
14 opportunity to be statewide no longer existed. I don't know
15 exactly when that started. So I was only deputized for the City
16 of Madison.

17 Q Okay. And can you describe your work as a registration
18 deputy for Madison?

19 A Yeah. I would sit at a table outside of a local grocery
20 store where the grocery allowed us to have a table for actually
21 many weeks -- days during the week before an election, and many
22 people considered that a real convenience and would say, oh, I
23 need to do this and stop by. And then I've also been on the
24 University of Wisconsin campus in Madison just with a clipboard
25 asking students if they were registered and would like to

1 register.

2 Q Okay. And describe me the process of actually registering
3 someone when you were a registration deputy.

4 A Okay. When I first started, I would have my clipboard,
5 piece of paper, and the individual could just either give me the
6 last four digits of their Social Security number if they did not
7 have a Wisconsin driver's license or they could fill in their
8 driver's license number, and they did not even need to have that
9 if it was a memorized number. And then they would fill out
10 either their change of address or their new address -- their
11 only address if they were a new voter, check off the box that
12 they were a citizen, and, you know, et cetera. Then I would
13 sign it. They would sign it. And I could do this up to 20 days
14 before an election, and it would go to the city clerk's office
15 for confirming all of that information.

16 Q And then how would the city clerk's office confirm that
17 information?

18 A They would use their database and then send a postcard to
19 that address, and it was first class, so if it didn't bounce
20 back, my understanding was that would confirm the address.

21 Q Okay. Did you ever hear any complaints about the
22 registrations that you submitted?

23 A No.

24 Q And how many people would you say that you registered to
25 vote as a Special Registration Deputy?

1 A Probably 50 to 75 people.

2 Q Okay. And for how long were you a Special Registration
3 Deputy?

4 A I'm thinking it was a year and a half to two years that I
5 was actively doing it.

6 Q And why did you stop?

7 A Well, when it became necessary for a person to have
8 documentation with them, I just didn't think I would find many
9 people who had that. I'm kind of old school, so I don't have
10 any of my bills or lease or any of the requested documentation,
11 and I don't have anything on my phone because I don't do that
12 kind of work on my phone.

13 Q Okay. And you're referring to the change in -- the 2014
14 change in the law --

15 A Yeah. Then they would have to prove their residence to me
16 by showing me this documentation, and I didn't really understand
17 why because, as I understood it, that process of -- the city
18 clerk was taking care of that and could ascertain whether
19 someone actually lived at that address, and I didn't know there
20 was a problem with it.

21 Q Okay. And you mentioned that you didn't do that type of
22 work on your phone, and you mean --

23 A I still don't. Yeah, I just don't handle any bills,
24 banking, et cetera. I just do phone calls, e-mail, and texts.

25 Q Right. And do you think many of the voters or some of the

1 voters that you have interacted with as a registration deputy
2 would be in a similar situation?

3 A Now that I have worked to register people at the polls, I
4 realize that most young people have something on their phone.
5 It's not so much the case that someone in my age range has
6 showed me something on their phone.

7 Q Okay.

8 A Yeah.

9 Q And so people are still continuing to have to meet these
10 proof of residency requirements now but at the polling place
11 where you worked that you mentioned earlier?

12 A Yeah, yeah.

13 Q And we'll talk about that in a little bit. Can you
14 describe some of the forms of documentation that the change in
15 the law required?

16 A Well, it just made a list of specific forms, and we
17 actually designate them with a letter, so "B" in general refers
18 to banks. "U" is utilities of any kind including Charter, MG&E,
19 and I'm not going to go through all the other ones, but "R"
20 would be for lease, residential lease, and we can take pay
21 stubs, and there's a different initial for each one.

22 Q Okay.

23 A And I should mention that in my work as an SRD, it just
24 went from needing none of those things, and the same thing with
25 registration at the polls, to first putting those initials down

1 and then later having to add the entity. So not just "U" but
2 MG&E, and then later adding the digits of their account number.

3 Q Okay. And now you're describing things that people -- new
4 requirements that people have to do at the polls on election
5 day?

6 A Yeah. I just want people to realize that during these
7 several years, I saw a big change.

8 Q Okay. Describe some of those changes and what you've
9 observed as a poll worker. Actually, let me back up a little
10 bit and tell me about your background as a poll worker, and then
11 we'll talk about those changes.

12 A Okay. So I guess, first of all, would be maybe why I
13 started doing it. It's just I've always been a regular voter
14 since I was 18. I think everyone's vote is important, and every
15 voter matters, and so that's why I decided to volunteer. I had
16 a little more time. I've also really liked election day because
17 it's been a community event. I lived at the same address for 25
18 years, walked to the same polling place. Then I moved and
19 decided that I would get involved at my polling place and be a
20 poll worker there, so that's what I did.

21 Q And which polling place is this?

22 A I work at Capitol Lakes Retirement Center in downtown
23 Madison.

24 Q And can you describe the type of voters that you service at
25 that center?

1 A Yeah. It's a wide range because we get a lot of university
2 students, then we get the people who live in that retirement
3 center from nursing care to assisted living to independent
4 living, and then in between there are a lot of condo and
5 apartment dwellers, young people and retired people.

6 Q Okay. So students and elderly people?

7 A Yeah. If you're calling me elderly.

8 Q No, I meant --

9 A Not in the nursing home yet.

10 Q I apologize. I did not mean to insinuate that at all. A
11 moment ago you were describing the changes in the amount of
12 information that you as a poll worker are required to take from
13 a voter when they register or update their registration at the
14 polls?

15 A Right.

16 Q Can you describe those changes in a little more detail to
17 me and what your observations about them are?

18 A Okay. First of all, I tend to work at the registration
19 table in my poll worker role. It seemed to boil down to because
20 it's a more complex task than the other tasks on voting day, and
21 so I have kind of got a niche in doing that, and so, as I said,
22 the first time I started working there we just had to write the
23 "U," "V," et cetera, on the forms.

24 Q I see.

25 A I started working as a poll worker at the point when that

1 was required.

2 Q And that was in --

3 A I can't tell you exactly what year it was, but it's all
4 since -- probably 2013. I've worked five elections at this
5 polling place, and I have not yet worked a presidential election
6 just by the way. So it was definitely after 2012.

7 Q Okay.

8 A So there's a line of people at our particular polling place
9 the whole time, so it's a very intense process. I do it every
10 minute practically when I'm there.

11 Q Okay.

12 A And so we have people fill out a form on a clipboard and
13 then come to us. We check their form to be sure everything is
14 all right, and then we have to ask them for their proof of
15 address, and they -- I mentioned the different options for that.
16 We have a spot on the form to write down the initial and then,
17 as I said, at one election it changed so that we began writing
18 down the actual entity and then had to write down at another
19 election -- again, this is out of the five I worked in, and I
20 can't tell you which one -- but the last two at least I have
21 been writing down people's -- the last four digits of their
22 account numbers.

23 Q So their account numbers on their bank accounts or their
24 utility bills or something. And in your experience as a poll
25 worker and someone registering voters, has that increased your

1 confidence at all in the accuracy or the truthfulness of these
2 registrations?

3 A No.

4 Q Okay.

5 A I didn't really have a worry about it.

6 Q Okay. And let's talk about the account numbers for a
7 moment. So it's just a part of an account number if you use a
8 bank account --

9 A Uh-huh.

10 Q -- or a utility statement. Do you know whether anyone ever
11 calls the bank or the utility company to confirm that this
12 document is truthful?

13 A I don't know that personally, but I felt uneasy about
14 collecting the information, and I thought a voter might ask me
15 sometime about it, and so I did call my own utility company,
16 bank, and internet service provider -- I'm sorry, I didn't call
17 them, I e-mailed them, and each one of them responded almost
18 immediately. My question was, poll workers are asking for this
19 information. If you were to be called by the city clerk's
20 office to confirm my identity, would you give them my identity
21 based on these digits and tell them that I was at that bank?
22 And they all --

23 MR. MURPHY: Object as hearsay, Your Honor.

24 THE COURT: I'll overrule it. Go ahead.

25 THE WITNESS: Okay. They just responded no, that they

1 would need a court order to do that.

2 MR. MARTIN: Okay.

3 THE WITNESS: And that my privacy was protected.

4 BY MR. MARTIN:

5 Q Okay. So in administering these requirements, has it
6 impacted the amount of time it takes to register voters at your
7 polling location?

8 A It has.

9 Q Can you describe that?

10 A As I said, in our location I'm busy the whole time
11 registering people, so there's always a line and -- or almost
12 always a line I would say, and so every few minutes matters, and
13 so just having to get those account numbers, write down the
14 entity, it just takes a little time. Even on a lease it's
15 difficult because you kind of have to read down and find where
16 the actual leasing company is on it because they're all
17 different, and there's a different line that they're on. So
18 it's just -- it may not seem like much, but it adds up when
19 you've got a long line of people.

20 Q Okay. And how would you compare the length of time that
21 this process takes now to when you first started?

22 A As I said, probably a minute or two longer.

23 Q For each voter?

24 A Yeah. And, again, it varies on how quick they are to get
25 out their information because on a screen it can take quite a

1 long time for them to pull it up, so it's kind of hard to
2 compare apples to apples.

3 Q Right. And have you encountered voters who have been
4 unable to provide that documentary proof of residency?

5 A I've had voters who could not provide it without helping --
6 us helping them by having a laptop there for them to pull
7 something up.

8 Q Okay.

9 A Because they didn't have it in their possession or on their
10 phone.

11 Q And do you know whether every polling location has a laptop
12 like that?

13 A I don't --

14 MR. MURPHY: Object to foundation.

15 THE COURT: It's a question about whether she knows.

16 THE WITNESS: I do not know.

17 BY MR. MARTIN:

18 Q Okay. And since you started working as a poll worker, the
19 voter ID law has also come into effect; is that correct?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And how many elections have you participated in or worked
22 as a poll worker in with the voter ID law in effect?

23 A Two. I missed the earliest one, and I have done this past
24 February and April.

25 Q Okay. Can you describe your observations in those

1 elections with the voter ID law?

2 A I think that in general at my polling place people seem to
3 have gotten the word that they needed an ID, and it's slowed
4 down the process, and there was some confusion with the polling
5 staff, getting it going. We staffed up at ours by a third.

6 Q Okay.

7 A So we had additional people, but a lot of them had little
8 experience.

9 Q Right.

10 A And so I wouldn't say it was like perfectly smooth, but
11 February was great because it was a slow -- very slow election.

12 Q Right.

13 A So I had one problem where I could not allow someone to
14 vote.

15 Q And we'll talk about that in a moment.

16 A Okay.

17 Q But let's go back to your comment about the poll workers
18 increasing by a third. And how many additional people is that?

19 A In our polling place I think it was about four extra
20 people.

21 Q Okay.

22 A And in the City of Madison it was many hundreds that -- I
23 know because I was helping to round up volunteers because of an
24 e-mail the city clerk's office sent out about how many
25 additional people they would need.

1 Q Okay. And how many polling locations are there in Madison?

2 A 87.

3 Q Okay. And you participated in a process of signing up
4 several hundred, you said, additional poll workers?

5 A I sent out -- I mean, not if you're implying I signed up
6 several hundred, but I think there were 600, if I remember
7 right, that we needed, and so they just asked us to e-mail our
8 friends.

9 Q Okay. Let's talk about the person in February who you had
10 to turn away you said.

11 A Uh-huh.

12 Q Can you describe that?

13 A Yeah. It was one of our registered voters, so I was
14 standing at the poll book, and his name was in there, and he
15 showed me his Wisconsin -- I mean his Minnesota driver's
16 license, which was a current license with his likeness on the
17 license, and he had no other acceptable ID. We offered him a
18 provisional ballot, and he did not take that. But I could see
19 why he was legitimately confused because there were people with
20 passports that didn't indicate what state they were from, and
21 people can also show Wisconsin driver's license as a proof of
22 identity even if the address isn't correct.

23 Q Right.

24 A And so, I mean, there's been a lot of education about the
25 fact that if you could get a prescription drug and drive, you

1 can vote, and I think he just thought, you know --

2 Q He can do those things so --

3 A Yeah, so he could vote. So I could really see how he got
4 confused.

5 Q Right. And you mentioned that people were using Wisconsin
6 addresses [verbatim] that don't have a current address, and
7 that's because the ID law isn't there to confirm residency,
8 right? That's the proof of registration requirements, correct?

9 A Yeah.

10 Q And have you experienced fellow poll workers who have had a
11 hard time keeping track of the difference between the proof of
12 residency requirements and the ID requirements?

13 A Yes.

14 Q Can you talk a little bit about that?

15 A I think especially if you register people, there was
16 definitely some confusion at the first election among the poll
17 workers about whether that -- the address had to be current on
18 the driver's license because it's a different standard for each.
19 For registration proof of address, it must be current, but not
20 for purposes of identity.

21 Q And have you similarly observed voters who have a hard time
22 keeping those two distinct?

23 A Yes. Some people I have had to say, no, your address does
24 not have to be current.

25 Q Okay. And have there been any other incidents maybe in the

1 April election that you observed where you had to turn someone
2 away because of the ID law?

3 A Yes. In that election -- and I should mention I feel
4 really bad about these, especially because they were both
5 registered, legitimate voters, and so this man also -- a young
6 man was in our poll book, but then when it came time to show his
7 ID, he was a student, and he had a student ID and his proof of
8 enrollment, but he didn't realize that the ID he was using was
9 not a student voter ID.

10 Q Right.

11 A And so, again, it had a picture of him. It looked just
12 like him. We knew he was one of our voters. He was in our poll
13 book. And so I felt really bad about turning him away, and,
14 again, he did not want a provisional ballot.

15 Q He did not. Do you have an opinion about why either one of
16 these individuals did not want a provisional ballot?

17 A I think because we explained to them what it would involve,
18 that they would have to come up with the correct ID within three
19 days and then get it to the city clerk's office in order to have
20 their vote be counted. Apparently -- I mean, I can only guess,
21 but it sounded like they didn't think they'd be able to do that.

22 Q Okay. Fair enough. Now, you were -- felt compelled to
23 write some articles about your experience as a poll worker,
24 correct?

25 A I did.

1 Q Can you describe those articles and the reasons that you
2 decided to write them?

3 A Well, the first article I wrote was called "Open Letter
4 from a Poll Worker to the Student I Turned Away Yesterday," and
5 it was published in Madison the day after the February election,
6 and it was about the situation I described with the young man,
7 and I tried to speak as a nonpartisan poll worker and just say,
8 I feel bad about this. I know it's confusing from the two
9 aspects I mentioned, a passport would work, noncurrent license,
10 Wisconsin ID would work, and I said I know that was you. I know
11 you weren't impersonating a voter. And then I listed the ways
12 he could get an ID and what they were and for future reference
13 to tell other people.

14 Q You felt the need to educate the public?

15 A Yeah, yeah.

16 Q And do you feel like the public had been adequately
17 educated up to that point?

18 A I don't think so, and I actually am just making my way
19 along as a poll worker. We were getting changes even by e-mail
20 down to the April election. One of the new things in our
21 training was that people with a citation or a rescinded --
22 temporarily rescinded license can vote without a photo ID if
23 they showed those pieces -- those documents.

24 Q And by citation you mean like a speeding ticket?

25 A A speeding ticket, yeah, and so I just thought, well, this

1 is weird and confusing. There must have been some people who
2 came up against that.

3 Q When did you learn about that requirement?

4 A In the training for the April election, so it had happened
5 between February and April, and then the thing we got by e-mail
6 a couple of days before had to do with the process of checking
7 people in and the ability to take a veteran's ID as a proof of
8 identity.

9 Q And just to sort of summarize what you're saying is that
10 the laws were changing up until the eve of the election; that's
11 right?

12 A Yeah. And that actually gets me to the point of the second
13 article. I don't know if you had a question before that because
14 I didn't quite finish. The second one was called "I'm a Poll
15 Worker and I've Come to Dread My Job," and it was because I
16 realized on the eve of the election that I was just -- I knew it
17 would be a very busy election compared to February, and I work
18 in a very high-density polling place to begin with, so we can
19 have just many, many people coming through there.

20 Q Let me stop you right there real quick. How did you know
21 it was going to be a high-intensity election?

22 A I knew because they were in a primary that many Republicans
23 and many Democrats had strong motivation, strong feelings, so it
24 was predicted that it would be a high turnout.

25 Q Right. Go on.

1 A So we were prepared for that and staffed up for it, but I
2 realized that I, first of all, wanted to serve voters well, and
3 I didn't want them to get a sense of confusion because I just
4 think that's really damaging to democracy if they feel like
5 their poll workers don't know because I feel like we're some of
6 the more trusted people out there, and so I wanted to be sure I
7 understood everything well and didn't look confused or lead them
8 astray.

9 And then I just kind of have two feelings that are more
10 emotional, just that I felt intrusive more and more about asking
11 for the account information. It just kind of nagged at me. And
12 the second thing was just that I've always felt like it was a
13 very trusting atmosphere at the polls, and it seemed to be
14 growing more trusting -- you know, less trusting between poll
15 workers and voters, like we were starting out with a distrust
16 rather than trust even though I think everyone tries to be
17 really encouraging to voters and helpful to voters. There's
18 that underlying thing, and especially for college students
19 because I felt like they had an additional thing they had to do
20 by showing their proof of enrollment.

21 Q Right.

22 A That seemed especially untrusting.

23 Q Right.

24 A And one last thing, because I work in a retirement
25 community, in the first election in February there was a man who

1 his license was close to being expiring, and he would have had
2 no reason -- he stopped driving years ago, using a walker and
3 stuff, and I thought, oh, my gosh, I hope I don't run into
4 somebody who lives here, and people around it all know him, but
5 I have to turn him away from voting when he's been voting all
6 these years. I mean, I just -- I was really worried about that.
7 So there were just things like that. I worried how the new
8 people would do and things like that.

9 Q Right. And so you said that you felt that there was a
10 dynamic of -- the default position was one of distrust rather
11 than trust now?

12 A Yeah.

13 Q And that's, from your point of view as a poll worker, as a
14 result of the state's laws, right?

15 A Uh-huh.

16 Q And in your opinion, are you more confident in the
17 integrity of the election system now because of these laws?

18 A No.

19 Q Are you less confident?

20 A I think I am because to me the integrity means that every
21 eligible voter gets to vote and have their vote counted.

22 Q Right. And the gentleman you mentioned whose ID was about
23 to expire and who lived in Capitol Lakes, I take it, that's a
24 situation where everyone there knows him. There's no doubt
25 about where he lives, but --

1 A Uh-huh, right.

2 Q -- if he failed to meet this residency requirement, you
3 would have to turn him away?

4 A I even know he lives there.

5 Q Right, right. I don't know if you had started working
6 before this option had been eliminated, but were you aware that
7 you used to be able to corroborate the residency and identity of
8 a person at the polls?

9 A I was aware, but that hasn't been an option while I have
10 been working.

11 Q Okay.

12 A It would have given peace of mind if I knew someone could
13 do that.

14 MR. MARTIN: Right. Okay. I think that is it for me,
15 Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Okay. Before we turn you over for
17 cross-examination, Capitol Lakes Retirement Center, is that
18 right around the corner from the courthouse here?

19 THE WITNESS: It is.

20 THE COURT: Okay. Cross-examination.

21 CROSS-EXAMINATION

22 BY MR. MURPHY:

23 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Scherpelz. I'm Mike Murphy. We talked
24 a couple times on the phone.

25 A Yeah.

1 Q So hello.

2 A Hello.

3 Q So I want to make sure I have the time line correct here.
4 You talked about being a registration deputy and doing work at
5 grocery stores. Do I have it correct that you have not done
6 that since the changes in the law that you discussed?

7 A I have not.

8 Q So you don't have a comparison personally for before and
9 after?

10 A I don't.

11 Q Okay. And you now work at a polling place, and you do some
12 registration work, but you did not do that before the laws
13 changed, the document laws changed, right?

14 A Not when it was just give us your last four digits and fill
15 in your driver's license, but I did it as the law changed so
16 that we had to include the entity that we gave the initials for
17 and then include the last four digits, so those were incremental
18 changes.

19 Q Okay. This might just be a matter of clarification, but
20 you did not work at polling places before there was a
21 requirement to show the documents, just since when the
22 requirements of what you have written down is different?

23 A Right, right.

24 Q Okay. So you can't make a comparison to before and after
25 showing documents?

1 A I can't.

2 Q Okay. You discussed two people who came to vote and didn't
3 have a qualifying ID, right?

4 A Uh-huh.

5 Q One was a student who didn't have a qualifying student ID.
6 Do you know what's involved in getting a qualifying student ID
7 here in Madison?

8 A Yes, I do.

9 Q Okay.

10 A I'm actually a senior guest auditor, so I have a Wiscard
11 which wouldn't allow me to vote, but if I wanted to get a
12 student ID, I would go to the same place where you get your
13 Wiscard, stand in line, have my picture taken, and then they
14 would give me a second card.

15 Q Okay. So you're familiar with the Union South location
16 where that can be done?

17 A Uh-huh.

18 Q And the Gordon Commons location where that can be done,
19 expanded during election times?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And that person who came to vote in April did not want a
22 provisional ballot and left saying he was going to try to get a
23 qualifying ID, right?

24 A Right.

25 Q And you don't know if he came back or not?

1 A I don't because I work half days, so I don't know.

2 Q So you just can't speak to whether or not he was able to
3 vote that day?

4 A I can't.

5 Q And the other person with the out-of-state driver's
6 license, he or she also said that they were going to come back,
7 get a qualifying ID and come back, right, or look for one?

8 A That one I don't think did. The first one did.

9 Q Okay.

10 A Yeah.

11 THE COURT: The student came back.

12 THE WITNESS: He said he would try to.

13 THE COURT: The student said he would try to come back
14 with the student voting ID.

15 THE WITNESS: He had two possible options. One was to
16 go over to Union South or another location to get the proper ID.
17 The second one, he could have had a passport, but he believed
18 his had expired. You can't use one that's more than two years
19 expired.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 BY MR. MURPHY:

22 Q But you don't know whether he came back with a passport
23 that day?

24 A I don't. I was not there.

25 MR. MURPHY: That's all.

1 THE COURT: Any redirect?

2 MR. MARTIN: Nothing from me, Your Honor.

3 THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Scherpelz.

4 (Witness excused at 3:08 p.m.)

5 THE COURT: Next up. Just to let you know what my
6 thinking is on scheduling here: When you get to the 3:45 to
7 4:00 neighborhood, we'll take our afternoon break and then come
8 back for the closing session.

9 MR. SPIVA: Okay, great.

10 THE COURT: Wherever you have a natural break in that
11 range.

12 MR. SPIVA: Sounds good. Your Honor, we call
13 Dr. Kenneth Mayer.

14 **KENNETH MAYER, PLAINTIFFS' WITNESS, SWORN,**

15 DIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. SPIVA:

17 Q Good afternoon, Dr. Mayer.

18 A Good afternoon.

19 THE COURT: Do you have a copy of Dr. Mayer's report?

20 MR. SPIVA: I do.

21 THE COURT: Could you hand those out?

22 MR. SPIVA: Will do. And these are on our exhibit
23 list, but for some reason the copies I have didn't have the
24 exhibit numbers, but I wrote them on.

25 THE COURT: Okay.

1 BY MR SPIVA:

2 Q So Dr. Mayer, what is your area of expertise?

3 A Generally in political science, the study of American
4 politics with specialties in election administration,
5 presidential power, elections generally, election law.

6 Q Okay. Let me ask you to turn in your initial report,
7 plaintiffs' exhibit 38, to your CV which appears on PX38, begins
8 on page 50. It's Exhibit 1 to your initial report.

9 A So my copy of the report does not have my CV.

10 Q Okay. Why don't we put it up on the monitor. And I don't
11 know if we can make that a little easier to see. That's just
12 the first page --

13 THE COURT: Just do it by chunk, and also I'll tell you
14 to give me the 10,000-foot view.

15 MR. SPIVA: Yeah, absolutely. That was my intent.

16 THE COURT: You're not going to need to qualify him as
17 an expert here. I'm going to hear his testimony. Just give me
18 the highlights of his qualifications, and we can be done with
19 that. Don't need to belabor it.

20 MR. SPIVA: Okay.

21 BY MR. SPIVA:

22 Q So, Dr. Mayer, where are you employed?

23 A I'm employed in the Political Science Department at the
24 University of Wisconsin-Madison.

25 Q And how long have you been there?

1 A Since 1989.

2 Q What do you teach?

3 A I teach courses in American politics, presidency, campaign
4 finance, graduate courses on the presidency and American
5 politics. I have taught courses on election law, comparative
6 electoral systems, and the odd special topic seminar from time
7 to time.

8 Q Have you written any peer-reviewed articles or books
9 relevant to the topics that you're going to be testifying on
10 today?

11 A Quite a few.

12 Q Okay. And I take it you got your Ph.D. from Yale
13 University in 1988 in political science?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q And you have an M.A. from Yale University in 1987 also in
16 political science?

17 A That's correct.

18 Q And your undergraduate degree is from the University of
19 California-San Diego also in political science?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Okay. And what did we ask you to do in this case?

22 A I was asked to evaluate the effects of the changes in
23 registration and election administration practices since 2011
24 primarily by analyzing the Statewide Voter Registration System
25 and the Department of Transportation list of driver's licenses

1 and IDs to look at the individual-level effects on the
2 probability that a registrant would cast a ballot.

3 Q Let me ask you, if we could put up page 4 of Dr. Mayer's
4 initial report, PX38. You can turn in your hard copy. Can you
5 just at first at a kind of a high level give us a summary of
6 what you concluded along the lines of what you laid out here on
7 page 4 of your report. Your Honor, I think this PX38 I believe
8 is not objected to. Correct me if I'm --

9 THE COURT: Is it?

10 MR. JOHNSON-KARP: No objection.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. I'll admit it.

12 MR. SPIVA: Thank you.

13 THE WITNESS: The primary conclusion that I reached was
14 that the probability that an individual -- individuals voted in
15 2014 went down among certain key groups, particularly
16 African-Americans, Latinos, individuals who resided in a student
17 ward, and among people who did not show up as possessing a
18 driver's license or Wisconsin state ID, and I found that most of
19 those effects were either entirely absent or much smaller in the
20 2010 election before any of these restrictions had gone into
21 effect.

22 I did some ancillary analysis that looked at the number of
23 individuals who registered on the weekend before -- the late
24 weekend registration in the weekend before elections and through
25 2006 and 2010, which was the time period that the SVRS was

1 started in the last election where you could do that. I
2 subsequently also reviewed some materials relating to the ID
3 petition process and the issuance and status of provisional
4 ballots in the April 2016 primary.

5 BY MR. SPIVA:

6 Q And what did you conclude with respect to the effects of
7 the photo ID requirement on minorities and young voters?

8 A There are two pieces to that. The one piece of information
9 is that the nonpossession rate for driver's licenses and photo
10 IDs, which I believe was among all registrants, was 8.4 percent.
11 That nonpossession rate was higher for African-Americans and
12 Latinos and significantly higher among people who resided in
13 student wards. If you looked at the individual-level analysis
14 that I did, that each of those characteristics, being
15 African-American, being Latino, residing in a student ward, all
16 had a significant depressive effect on the probability that a
17 registrant cast a ballot in 2014.

18 Q All right. And we're going to look at each of those in
19 some detail. But before we do that, can you describe the
20 sources that you drew upon and your methodology that you used in
21 reaching your conclusion?

22 A The primary source material that I used was a copy of the
23 Statewide Voter Registration System, which is the statewide list
24 of all registered voters, and that was pulled in September of
25 2015. At about the same time I believe I received the database

1 from the Department of Transportation listing everyone who
2 possessed a driver's license or state ID. The primary method
3 that I used was to try to match those to databases. That gave
4 me information on the race of individuals who did match because
5 self-identified races data, that's collected by the Department
6 of Transportation. It also for people who did not match, I used
7 race probability data from a national voting technologies firm
8 called Catalist.

9 Q Can you explain that?

10 A Catalist is a national voter data company that provides
11 primarily information to campaigns and other organizations that
12 they use for voter contact, and one of the things that they do
13 is provide estimates of the rates of registered voters, which in
14 a state like Wisconsin, which is not a Section 5 or former
15 Section 5 state, does not collect race information as part of
16 the voter registration process, and it provides an estimate of
17 the probability -- it provides an estimate of the racial
18 identification of registered voters, at least is how I use them.
19 They use a combination of demographic data, location, name,
20 census block, date of birth. It's validated through a number of
21 processes, and it provides, based on some tests that I
22 conducted, a very high degree of confidence that they get the
23 racial identification correct.

24 Q What is it about -- what gives you confidence in their
25 data?

1 A I received probability estimates of the race of everybody
2 in the SVRS.

3 THE COURT: From Catalist.

4 THE WITNESS: From Catalist. I also at the conclusion
5 of the matching process, I had successfully matched about 91.6
6 percent of the registrants matched up to a unique record in the
7 Department of Transportation. For each one of those
8 individuals, I had both the Catalist estimate of their race as
9 well as their self-identified race, which they themselves had
10 entered when they applied for a driver's license or state ID,
11 and they matched about 96 percent of the time, which I took to
12 be a very high degree of confidence that they got it right.

13 BY MR. SPIVA:

14 Q So Catalist got it right 96 percent of the time?

15 A That's correct.

16 Q Okay.

17 THE COURT: Is there some reason to think that the 8.4
18 percent of the voter records that you didn't have matches for
19 from the Wisconsin driver's license database were particularly
20 racially ambiguous records?

21 THE WITNESS: I don't, and the reason is that the -- to
22 the degree that Catalist made errors, and it was a non-zero
23 error rate -- it was small -- about 90 percent of the errors
24 amounted to misclassifying someone who was a minority as white.
25 So I was not overidentifying members of minority populations.

1 What I was doing or what Catalist was doing was mistakenly
2 classifying minority registrants as white, and what that has the
3 effect of doing is it actually biases all of my estimates
4 towards zero. So the estimates that I produce are actually
5 smaller than what they would be if I had absolute accuracy in
6 the identification, but the numbers of inaccurate
7 identifications was so small that in my view it would not have
8 had a material effect on any of my conclusions.

9 THE COURT: Because you already had 91.6 match from the
10 driver's license data, and then that meant that 8.4 percent of
11 the time you had to take an estimate based on the Catalist data.

12 THE WITNESS: That's correct. And that accuracy rate
13 of 96 percent carries across, and there's no reason to think
14 that it wouldn't. I'm looking at an error rate of, you know, on
15 the order of .7 percent, which is not material.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 BY MR. SPIVA:

18 Q Let me ask you to turn to table 3 which is on page 19 of
19 your initial report, plaintiffs' exhibit 38. And if you could
20 just explain what table 3 shows us.

21 A So there's quite a bit of processing that went on to get
22 this table.

23 Q And you can obviously explain that, please, in your answer.

24 A So do you want me to describe the matching process?

25 Q Yeah, to some extent. I think at least briefly, yeah.

1 A So I used a technique known as exact matching where you're
2 looking at particular variables that uniquely identify
3 individuals in one or the other databases, and I described the
4 process that I used. It was a three-pass matching process. On
5 a first pass one of the fields that exists in the SVRS is that
6 individuals who register using their driver's license or photo
7 ID number, that number is recorded, and those numbers are unique
8 or they are mostly unique. There's a small number of
9 duplicates, and so I simply matched -- for each person in the
10 SVRS, I matched to the person in the DOT with that driver's
11 license or ID number, and that was most of the matches that I
12 got.

13 For people who did not match, I then -- let me look at my
14 table of describing that process. It's on table 12 of my
15 report.

16 Q What page is that?

17 A That's page 12 of my report, table 1. So link step A is
18 the match on driver's license or ID number, and that produced
19 about 2.3 million linked records. The second pass I matched on
20 the last name, first name, date of birth, and zip code, and
21 there were a small -- trivial number of people who were
22 duplicated on this quadruplicate. I think it was on the order
23 of a dozen or so -- it was not many -- and I had eliminated
24 those duplicates, and then I matched to the correct person
25 or was able to match to the Department of Transportation for

1 another 631,000. And then I matched on the last name, first
2 name, and date of birth which gave me an additional set of
3 matches. The total --

4 THE COURT: That means that on the C pass there was not
5 a match on zip code?

6 THE WITNESS: Right. The way that it's done in exact
7 match is you start with the highest level of granularity and
8 then you expand it marginally, but, again, by the time I had got
9 to step C, there were very few duplicated records on this
10 triplicate, so it's not like I was matching a person in the SVRS
11 to the wrong person in the Department of Transportation file.

12 So the total number of linked records was 3,096,992. I had
13 283,346 unlinked records. Once I had conducted the linking
14 process, I went through that list and eliminated everybody who
15 had registered after the November 2014 election because I was
16 not going to be able to observe their voting behavior, and that
17 eliminated about 12,700 records, and so that gives me a list of
18 282,000 -- if we go back to table 3 -- 282,015 registered voters
19 who do not link to the Department of Transportation file, which
20 indicates they do not possess -- as of September 2015, they did
21 not possess a driver's license or photo ID.

22 BY MR. SPIVA:

23 Q So that's -- and that's 8.4 percent of the registered
24 voters don't have one of those types of IDs?

25 A That's correct. And because I have the racial

1 identification data either combination of the DOT or Catalist, I
2 can compute the percentage -- the nonpossession rate for
3 different subcategories. The nonpossession rate for white
4 registrants was 8.3 percent. For black registrants it was 9.8
5 percent so about almost 20 percent higher, and for Hispanic
6 registrants it was 11.1 percent, and for individuals who resided
7 in a student ward, a nonpossession rate of 21.4 percent.

8 Q And are those significant differences?

9 A I'm not sure that I would classify them as statistically
10 significant. I didn't do any significance tests. I suspect
11 they probably would be, but I can't say for certain, but one of
12 the things that's important here is all of this is entirely
13 consistent with the full range of literature on driver's license
14 and possession rate. There's nothing here that is surprising.
15 The nonpossession rate overall is in line with what similar
16 studies have found in other states, Pennsylvania, Texas, North
17 Carolina, Georgia. The fact that there are racial disparities
18 in the nonpossession rate was also completely in line with the
19 existing literature, so there's nothing in here that is an
20 outlier.

21 Q Would you --

22 THE COURT: I'm sorry to interrupt here. And I'm
23 retrenching just a touch on my suggestion that we be very high
24 level on your background, but it's apparent that you have used
25 some statistical analyses in your report, and your educational

1 background doesn't make it manifest how you have a background in
2 statistics. So if you would just recap that.

3 THE WITNESS: Sure. So my training in graduate school
4 included training in econometrics and statistics and actually
5 includes graduate level work in the statistics department.
6 These are all techniques I have used throughout my career in my
7 own work with high-level programming languages and high-level
8 statistical packages. This is also -- this particular matching
9 technique is also something that I have done in other court
10 cases. The particular statistical techniques that I use, in
11 particular the individual-level analysis itself, is not all that
12 sophisticated. The numbers --

13 THE COURT: This one here, what we've done here so far
14 you're talking about?

15 THE WITNESS: Well, when we get to the individual-level
16 probit analysis, which estimates the underlying probabilities,
17 these are all techniques that I have used throughout my career
18 and in my own work.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 BY MR. SPIVA:

21 Q If I might, this is actually not a sample, right? This is
22 based on the entire data set?

23 A Right. And so it gets a little tricky trying to do
24 significance tests when you're dealing with full populations. I
25 suppose you could make the argument that the SVRS itself is a

1 subsample of the entire population of eligible voters. But as
2 far as I am aware, the literature that I have seen, this is not
3 something that people apply statistical tests to --

4 THE COURT: This isn't sampling and projection from a
5 sample case. This is the whole universe of registered voters.

6 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 MR. SPIVA: And then let me just -- I will kind of
9 retrench, Your Honor, since I didn't get the CV attached to that
10 one. The one that's in the record --

11 THE COURT: And I've got it digitally here.

12 MR. SPIVA: Okay.

13 BY MR. SPIVA:

14 Q But you were the Director of the Data and Computation
15 Center, College of Letters and Science, University of Wisconsin
16 from June 1996 through September 2003?

17 A That's correct.

18 Q And -- well, we've got the CV in the record probably better
19 than me, definitively not a statistical person, picking out the
20 things that I think --

21 THE COURT: Well, I guess -- it's apparent then -- tell
22 me if this is true. When you got your Ph.D., you had a research
23 tool requirement or something like that and --

24 THE WITNESS: There was a research methods requirement,
25 but I make extensive use of quantitative techniques. I have for

1 my whole career.

2 THE COURT: Okay. I'm satisfied.

3 BY MR. SPIVA:

4 Q Just do one more. You got the Robert Durr Award from the
5 Midwest Political Science Association for best paper applying
6 quantitative methods to a substantive problem presented at the
7 2013 meeting. You had some co-authors on election laws and
8 partisan gains.

9 A That's correct.

10 Q Okay. So, now, you are aware that Dr. Hood did a matching
11 analysis a little differently, and he says he was able to match
12 many more individuals between the DOT and the SVRS databases?

13 A That's correct.

14 Q And do you have any dispute with the way he did it?

15 A I do.

16 Q And what is that?

17 A There are two issues I have with the way Dr. Hood performed
18 his matching analysis. The first is that one of the steps that
19 he matched on was, I believe, the last name -- I think it was
20 last name, date of birth, and the last four digits of the Social
21 Security number, that triplicate. The problem with that is that
22 on that triplicate, there were 90,000 duplicated records in the
23 Department of Transportation database, and so it's almost a
24 certainty that he is producing a large number of false matches.
25 I can't say how many. It's probably about half assuming that

1 they're randomly assigning to the wrong person.

2 Q How did you handle the duplicates?

3 A I eliminated them. So before I did a match, and there
4 weren't many of them, I went through the Department of
5 Transportation database, and actually one of the issues -- we
6 should talk about this -- in the SVRS, there are actually some
7 duplicated records in the SVRS. It's the same individual, the
8 same name, the same birth date, the same address, who actually
9 appear more than once, and that's an artifact of the nature of
10 large-scale data sets with millions of records, and I went
11 through and eliminated all of those duplicates.

12 So I had done some preprocessing of both data sets to
13 eliminate -- they're also in the Department of Transportation
14 data set that I received. There are actually hundreds of
15 thousands of duplicates, people who show up as possessing both a
16 driver's license and a state ID, which is not supposed to
17 happen, but they're in there. The records show large numbers of
18 people who are deceased, and I removed those because that's one
19 of the status flags.

20 I went through with some care examining the data and
21 preprocessing it in a way that increased my confidence that the
22 matching that I did was matching the right individual in the
23 Statewide Voter Registration System to the right individual in
24 the Department of Transportation data set.

25 Q And do you have a lot of experience in training -- in

1 matching large databases and working with large databases?

2 A I do. I've done it a number of different times. There was
3 a state photo ID trial in 2011-2012 in which I did that. There
4 was also an analogous process that I did as part of a federal
5 redistricting trial here in Wisconsin in 2012 to identify
6 registered voters of Hispanic descent. So this is a technique
7 that I have used before and am familiar with.

8 Q Okay. And the court has accepted your technique in those
9 cases?

10 A They did.

11 Q What else was wrong with Professor Hood's matching process?

12 A The second thing that Dr. Hood did is when he had completed
13 his first matching process, which is similar to mine although he
14 produced -- actually he produced about 40,000 fewer -- actually
15 40,000 more matches than I did, which is roughly the same as the
16 number of duplicates on that one triplicate. At the result of
17 that process, he turned over the list of nonmatches to the
18 Department of Transportation, and they came back to him and told
19 him that about 90,000 of those individuals actually did show up
20 in their data as -- they said that they had a record of this
21 individual, and he accepted that, said I'm counting that as a
22 match. These people are showing up as a match.

23 I don't think that's the right way to go about that in part
24 because he has no information about how the Department of
25 Transportation actually conducted that match. He doesn't know,

1 and I don't know --

2 Q He didn't put anything in his report about how the
3 Department of Transportation did that?

4 A That's correct. And he admitted in his deposition that he
5 had no idea how they did it. We don't know whether they used
6 exact matching. We don't know whether they used probabilistic
7 matching. We don't know what fields they matched on; I simply
8 accepted that, which I don't think that's the proper way of
9 doing it. But as I noted in my rebuttal report, even if you
10 accept his smaller number of nonmatches, I was able to replicate
11 my analysis with his list of 145,000 people who didn't match as
12 opposed to my 283,000 people or 282,000 people who didn't match.
13 My substantive conclusions were identical. The coefficients
14 didn't change. People who didn't have an ID were less likely to
15 vote. People who were African-American, Latino, who were in
16 student wards, my substantive conclusions were identical. All
17 it means is that there's slightly fewer people who don't match.

18 Q Okay. And did he also -- I think he got down to about four
19 point -- I think it was 4.5 percent. I don't seem to have the
20 figure right in front of me.

21 A That's correct, 4.5 percent.

22 Q Matching kind of compared to your 8.4 percent. Did he then
23 make some kind of a jump to reduce it further?

24 A Sure. He then, after he concluded that his unspecified
25 matching process resulted in the 4.5 match rate, he then

1 speculated, and he said I think the real rate is probably closer
2 to 3 percent without any evidence. It was just speculation.

3 THE COURT: This is 3 percent of registered voters not
4 possessing --

5 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

6 THE COURT: -- ID. Okay.

7 BY MR. SPIVA:

8 Q And I think you said this, but even if he were right about
9 there being fewer people, does it make a difference to
10 your ultimate --

11 A Not to my substantive conclusions, no.

12 THE COURT: And by that you mean the proportionality
13 across these various groups of --

14 THE WITNESS: The effect of these variables, the effect
15 of not possessing an ID on not voting. It still is a large and
16 negative and statistically significant negative effect. The
17 effect of a registrant being black or Latino or residing in a
18 student ward, all those effects are roughly the same size.

19 THE COURT: Yeah. The difference being essentially
20 that it just affects fewer people.

21 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 BY MR. SPIVA:

24 Q If I could ask you to turn to your rebuttal report, which
25 is PX43, to page 12, the updated table 7, and then let me just

1 ask you, you know, there's an updated table 7 on page 12 and an
2 updated page -- updated table 8 on page 13. What are these
3 updated from?

4 A When I did the original analysis, one of the variables that
5 I included in the analysis was whether a registrant was female
6 because that's one of the -- that's one of the self-identified
7 features of the Department of Transportation database, and as I
8 was preparing for my rebuttal report, I discovered I made a
9 coding error in my original analysis which was that I actually
10 don't have gender information for people who didn't match. I
11 don't know what their gender is because I hadn't linked them.

12 And the way that I wrote the computer code, that for -- it
13 classified -- everybody was classified as female if their
14 underlying gender wasn't male. So that meant for the people who
15 did not match, that field was blank. I mistakenly characterized
16 all of those individuals as female, and that's wrong. So I had
17 to redo the analysis to make sure we had the correct
18 information, and so what I had to do was simply drop that
19 variable because I didn't have it for everybody, and the updated
20 table 7 and updated table 8 reflect that. Again, it doesn't
21 change any of my conclusions. It has really very, very small
22 effects on a couple of the variables, but not in any significant
23 way.

24 Q Okay. So there's a table 7 and a table 8 in your original
25 report, and these are updated versions of those tables?

1 A That's correct.

2 Q Okay. So looking at updated table 7 on page 12 of your
3 rebuttal report, can you explain that table to us?

4 A So this is the first time that I have been able to do or I
5 think anybody has been able to do this analysis in Wisconsin.
6 Up until now the inferences about the effect of voter ID have
7 occurred at the aggregate level. We try to observe changes in
8 turnout and try to analyze turnout in particular locations,
9 which is not an ideal way of doing it.

10 I have individual-level data. I have data for every
11 registered voter in the state. I know whether they voted
12 because voter history is part of the records. I have
13 demographic information about voters. I know their age. I know
14 their race. I know where they live. And I am able, therefore,
15 to do an individual-level analysis which calculates or estimates
16 the effects of these variables on the underlying probability
17 that an individual votes, and so this table shows the results of
18 that analysis where in all of these models the dependent
19 variable is whether someone cast a ballot in either the November
20 2014 election or in one of my controls, the 2010 election, and
21 that's classified as one if someone voted, zero if they didn't.

22 And then I have a number of these control variables which
23 is, just going through them, we know that voting behavior is
24 influenced by previous voting behavior. People get into the
25 habit of voting, so the likelihood that someone voted in 2014 is

1 going to depend in some sense on whether they have voted in
2 previous elections. We know their race. We know -- I'm sure
3 we'll talk about this in a bit. We know which wards I had
4 defined as student wards based on the location of colleges and
5 universities around the state. We know the age of the
6 registrant because one of the fields -- it's not a publicly
7 available field, but it was part of the disclosure. I know when
8 a registrant is born, so I can calculate their age.

9 And so I'm able to, using this technique, estimate the
10 effect of these coefficients on the probability that someone
11 votes, and the way that -- it can be difficult to interpret
12 these coefficients directly, but in general a coefficient that's
13 positive means that variable is associated with a higher
14 likelihood of voting. A coefficient that's negative is
15 associated with a lower probability of voting, and just to give
16 a brief summary of the second column, which is Model 1, 2010 to
17 2014, you see the first three coefficients, voted in 2012, voted
18 in recall, voted in 2010, those are all large and positive.

19 Q What does that mean? If you voted in 2012, what does --
20 and then you're in column one here with the .66, what does --

21 A Well, you actually can't -- you can't state directly
22 looking at this coefficient. You have to do another set of
23 calculations to convert these into probabilities, which is what
24 I did --

25 Q In table 8.

1 A -- in table 8.

2 Q Okay. So go ahead. We'll get there in a minute.

3 A What it means is that all of these coefficients are
4 statistically significant with the exception of the student ward
5 in 2014 in Control Model C3 which means that I think that
6 they're all significant at a level of .0001, which is an
7 extremely high level of precision reflecting the fact that I
8 have a large data set here. So voting in 2012, voting in the
9 recall, voting in 2010, these are all people who voted in those
10 elections, had a much higher probability of voting in 2014.

11 Being African-American, to register as African-American,
12 Hispanic, student ward, those are all negative, indicating that
13 people who were registrants who were African-American,
14 registrants who were Latino, registrants who live in a student
15 ward are less likely to vote. Similarly, for the effect of not
16 having an ID or license is minus .68. That's actually larger
17 than the positive effects of voting in 2012. So not having a
18 license means that -- the effect of not having a license is
19 actually larger and more negative than the positive effect of
20 voting in 2012. The age variables are all basically controls
21 because we know that turnout is positively associated with age,
22 and it's, in fact, what the coefficients show. As registrants
23 get older, they become --

24 THE COURT: And they're all positive because it's a
25 comparison from 2010 to 2014?

1 THE WITNESS: Not quite, Your Honor. The comparison is
2 that if all of these variables were zero, the probability would
3 be calculated using the constant, which is minus .43. So you
4 start with the constant, and then you add the value of these
5 coefficients based on whether someone meets those
6 characteristics.

7 THE COURT: Okay.

8 THE WITNESS: And the 2010 to 2014 comes in that I am
9 observing a snapshot of the SVRS in 2015. The SVRS is a dynamic
10 system. It changes -- I don't know how often the GAB updates
11 it, but it's probably on a weekly or monthly basis. It changes
12 all the time, and there's no archive of it. So I can observe
13 the SVRS in September of 2015. I can't go back to November of
14 2010 to look at what the SVRS was at that point. There's
15 constant churn. People move into the SVRS, they register.
16 People move out of the SVRS, people die, people move out of
17 state, their registrations are cancelled. The GAB conducts list
18 maintenance. Every so often they remove inactive voters, and so
19 the SVRS in September of 2015 is not going to be the same SVRS
20 that existed in November 2010. So what you need to do is to
21 account for that. What we observe at a point in time is going
22 to be different than what we would have observed in a previous
23 time had we been able to do that, and I controlled for that a
24 couple of different ways.

25 In the first Model 1, that is everybody who was in the SVRS

1 as of 2010, as of election day 2010, who were still in the SVRS
2 in September 2015. So what I've done is removed from the SVRS
3 everybody who registered after the election -- after election
4 day in 2010 because I'm interested in looking at the change from
5 2010 to 2014. I want to observe these same individuals. And
6 the comparison would be Control C1 which is for these -- well,
7 that's looking at individuals in -- voting behavior in 2010 for
8 people who have been in the SVRS since 2006. So the full range
9 of the SVRS. So that's giving me an estimate of the behavior of
10 people who have been in the SVRS at the -- since the beginning.
11 And so that's one point of comparison that I'm looking at,
12 people who have been in the SVRS for longer, but I'm observing
13 their behavior in 2010. And you can see that most of the
14 variables are roughly in the same category. There are few --

15 THE COURT: I guess here is my question, is that
16 there's a coefficient here that indicates likelihood of a person
17 voting in any election?

18 THE WITNESS: Just in 2010.

19 THE COURT: Just in 2010.

20 THE WITNESS: That's the control model.

21 THE COURT: Okay.

22 MR. SPIVA: You're talking about the column that's
23 labeled Control C1 voting in 2010 --

24 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

25 THE COURT: Okay. So we go back to the second column.

1 That coefficient represents the -- not exactly a probability but
2 a number that could be processed to get to a probability. In
3 other words, it's a coefficient that indicates the likelihood of
4 a person voting in some particular election?

5 THE WITNESS: In 2014.

6 THE COURT: In 2014. Okay.

7 THE WITNESS: And so the controls that I used account
8 for the fact that people are moving in and out of the SVRS at
9 different times. So I used a variety of starting points and
10 stopping points. So one -- the first model is looking at 2014
11 voting for everybody who was in the SVRS as of November 2010.
12 The second model looks at voting in 2014 using everybody who was
13 in the SVRS as of the recall. So I'm picking up in Model 2
14 everybody who registered between the general election in 2012 --
15 in 2010, I'm sorry, and the recall in 2012. And you can see all
16 of the coefficients are roughly the same size. There are a few
17 differences and some of them are a little bit different, but
18 there are no signs that flip. There are no major discrepancies
19 in the sizes of the coefficients.

20 And then the control models again use different starting
21 and stopping points, looking at voting in 2010, looking at
22 voting in 2014, looking at voting in 2014 with that subset of
23 registrants who only registered between 2010 and the recall, so
24 I'm capturing different cohorts of registrants, and with very
25 few exceptions all of the coefficients are the same size. They

1 all point in the same direction, which is that you observe
2 significant depressive effects in 2014 -- again, it doesn't
3 matter when people registered -- and it's not what you observe
4 when you are looking at voting behavior in 2010.

5 So the key here is that in 2010 none of these laws were in
6 effect. In 2014 they were all in effect with the exception of
7 voter ID, and we can talk about that in a little bit. I still
8 in my report drew some inferences about the effect of not
9 possessing an ID in 2014 in part because there was substantial
10 confusion among voters about whether it was in effect or not.

11 THE COURT: So one other question here. So we've got
12 people with no ID or license. So that would be -- because there
13 are other ways of voting even if you don't have -- so no ID, by
14 the way, that means no free DMV voter ID.

15 THE WITNESS: That's correct, Your Honor.

16 THE COURT: Okay. I'm calling it a voter ID because
17 it's not a driver's license. It's not really a voter ID.

18 MR. SPIVA: Is it any type of DOT ID or license?
19 Because I think there may be another ID other than the free ID.

20 THE WITNESS: It was anybody who showed up in the
21 database. Not everybody -- I don't know what the exact
22 percentages are, but a substantial number of people who have
23 procured an ID in the last five years have gotten a free voter
24 ID, but this also counts people who got -- who possess a photo
25 ID that's not a driver's license even if it's not procured for

1 the purposes of voting.

2 THE COURT: Right. So anybody -- but it would not
3 include somebody who did not have one of those but they voted by
4 using their passports.

5 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

6 THE COURT: Okay. Because if the DMV ID was the only
7 way to vote, then the coefficient should be negative one, right?
8 That would indicate nobody could vote. Nobody in that condition
9 voted.

10 THE WITNESS: I'm trying to replicate the analysis in
11 my head. I think that's mostly right.

12 THE COURT: If you had a category here people who were
13 ages 16 and 17, their coefficient should be a negative one
14 because they should not have voted.

15 THE WITNESS: Well, it will amount to a 100 percent
16 reduction in the probability of their voting. One of the
17 reasons the effect is not one is that later on I'll show a table
18 that the effect of photo ID actually doesn't fall just on people
19 who don't possess a photo ID. I found, and other studies have
20 found, that some of the people who don't vote because of what
21 will show up as a lack of photo ID actually have a photo ID, but
22 they believe that it doesn't qualify, and so that has the effect
23 of sort of making this coefficient smaller because there are
24 people who actually possess an ID but who are unable to vote
25 because they don't bring it or they've lost it or for whatever

1 reason.

2 THE COURT: Or if somebody said on principle I refuse
3 to take it out and show it to you to vote.

4 THE WITNESS: It's possible. And as I note in my
5 report, there is work that has investigated how many people who
6 don't possess a driver's license or an ID might possess one of
7 the other forms of qualifying IDs, a passport. I did not have
8 access to any of that data, and the answer is that there are
9 some people who do possess that. It's not a large percentage,
10 but it's definitely not zero.

11 THE COURT: Okay.

12 BY MR. SPIVA:

13 Q There's literature on that though, isn't there, on who
14 possesses passports and how big of a percentage that is?

15 A That's correct. There was a report I cited in my report
16 that Professor Charles Stewart of MIT did for a voting rights
17 trial actually on behalf of the U.S. Department of Justice where
18 he did have access to all of that data. He was able to match
19 people with passports, veterans ID. I think those were the
20 two --

21 Q Military IDs?

22 A And military IDs, and I can't remember off the top of my
23 head, but the number was nonzero, but it was not large.

24 Q In terms of demographics, who tends to hold passports
25 demographically?

1 A Well, I don't know that I have concrete data on that, but I
2 know that passports are expensive and that it wouldn't surprise
3 me in the least that there would be a racial disparity in the
4 possession of passports.

5 Q Okay. Should we turn to table 8? Do you feel like you've
6 had a chance to fully explain table 7?

7 A So the way in which you translate probit coefficients into
8 understandable probabilities, the probit is a nonlinear
9 regression technique. A linear regression does not work with
10 binary variables because linear regression assumes that the
11 effect of any variable is the same anyplace on the scale, and we
12 know that as you get close to one or zero, that if you already
13 have a 98 percent underlying probability of voting, there's no
14 variable that's going to have a significant effect on that, and
15 linear regression routinely produces probability estimates that
16 are outside the bounds; they're greater than one or less than
17 zero. So what probit does is convert the data into an
18 underlying -- essentially the shape of a sideways "S." That it
19 is flat at the bottom, it gets steep in the middle, and then it
20 flattens out as you get to one.

21 So that means that in order to interpret the coefficients,
22 you need to know where you are on that underlying probability
23 distribution. The effect of a variable when you are at about .5
24 is going to be much greater than it is when you are at .98
25 or .01. So the standard technique for doing that is you take

1 all of the variables and you insert their mean values, and that
2 gives you what amounts to the equivalent of the average voter,
3 and then for the variable that you are interested in, you change
4 the value of that. And so this table shows the probabilistic
5 effects -- the effect on the underlying probability of voting
6 for the variables of interest here which are the demographic
7 categories --

8 Q So let me ask you, if I were to look at the column labeled
9 "2014 Model 1 (2010-2014)" and the row "black," it says negative
10 2.5 percent. What does --

11 A That means for -- with all of the other variables set to
12 their mean value, so we can conceptualize that as the mean
13 voter, that that mean voter who was black is 2.5 percentage
14 points or, if we use the zero/one probability range, .025 less
15 likely to vote than someone who is not black. Similarly, an
16 average voter who was Hispanic is 7.1 percentage points less
17 likely to vote than someone who is not Hispanic. Someone who
18 resides in a student ward is 6.7 percentage points less likely
19 to vote than someone who does not live in a student ward. And
20 someone who does not show up as possessing an ID or a license is
21 almost 19 percentage points less likely to vote. And so this is
22 a way of allowing for a direct comparison of the underlying
23 probabilities across all of the models and variables. So these
24 are -- it's reasonable to think about these as the rough
25 equivalent of an underlying linear regression coefficient

1 because you can compare these directly.

2 Q Okay. And so what does that mean -- or what does this
3 address in terms of the effects of the laws being challenged in
4 this lawsuit?

5 A There are a couple of ways to approach it. That we cannot
6 observe the specific effect of each one of these changes on a
7 specific person because we cannot observe whether any specific
8 African-American or Latino person has had trouble surmounting
9 one of these obstacles. You actually can't make a statement
10 about the underlying registration difficulties, the proof of
11 address, the Special Registration Deputies, because we are only
12 observing people who have already registered. So these people
13 who have registered have already surmounted any of those
14 burdens.

15 So using this analysis, I can't make any claims about how
16 difficult it is for people to register because by the time I'm
17 able to observe their behavior, they're registered. It also --
18 I can't specifically identify, for example, what effect the
19 restriction on early voting has had because the SVRS does not
20 contain information about whether someone voted -- it does
21 usually record whether someone voted absentee or not, but it
22 doesn't tell me whether they voted in person or by mail. It
23 doesn't tell me when they submitted their ballot. I can't
24 observe that. But it does tell me -- the two pieces of
25 information that are most discrete is that we know based on

1 existing literature that photo ID laws suppress turnout, and
2 these are not inferential studies any longer. We now have
3 specific data from actual elections on the effect of turnout
4 based on photo IDs.

5 We also know the effect on students that have particular
6 requirements, that it's students, particularly thinking of
7 out-of-state students who face specific burdens that in-state
8 students do not. If I am a resident of Minnesota who attends
9 UW-LaCrosse, I am less likely than a Wisconsin resident to
10 surrender my Minnesota driver's license to get a Wisconsin photo
11 ID or driver's license for the purposes of voting. That means
12 I'm restricted to one of the other forms of ID. If I have a
13 passport, I'm fine. I might have to use my student ID, but
14 using a student ID, even if it's a qualifying form of
15 identification with the signature, issuance and expiration date,
16 in addition to that I still have to show proof of enrollment, so
17 there are higher burdens that apply to students. So I can
18 directly estimate the effect of those variables just as I can
19 observe the effect of photo ID.

20 Probably the main point about these is that these effects
21 are statistically significant. They are all in line with the
22 broader literature about the effect of these changes on turnout,
23 and they are all in the expected direction. There's nothing
24 that is surprising here in terms of thinking about the likely
25 consequences of these changes and the effects on individuals.

1 Now, we can also -- we will get to this ahead, but we now have
2 data from two elections where the photo ID laws have actually
3 been in effect.

4 Q Right.

5 A Here I'm drawing an inference based on the fact that there
6 were significant numbers, in the hundreds of thousands, of
7 registered voters who believed the photo ID was in effect. Now
8 we no longer have to concern ourselves with survey data because
9 we have actual election results and concrete consequences for
10 people who don't have a photo ID.

11 Q Okay. And so maybe you can walk us through like you did
12 with table 7 briefly what the significance of the various
13 columns are here.

14 A So each column corresponds to the same column --

15 Q Can I just ask before we get there, is this an
16 individual-level analysis or an aggregate?

17 A This is an individual-level analysis. I'm observing the
18 behavior of each individual. I can observe whether they vote or
19 not. I can observe all of these variables. I know how long
20 they've been in the SVRS, so this is an individual-level
21 analysis.

22 Q Okay. Go ahead.

23 A So each column in table 8 corresponds to the same column in
24 table 7. Now, I didn't produce the underlying probabilities for
25 all of the variables, just for clarity's sake. I'm not really

1 interested in what the underlying probability is for someone who
2 is between the ages of 55 and 64. And so we can compare, for
3 example -- well, let's take just as one example, if you look at
4 Model 1, we see the probabilities of these variables,
5 African-American, minus 2.5 percent; Hispanic, minus 7.1; and so
6 on. The second table is the --

7 THE COURT: The second column you mean? Stick with
8 that first -- just as simply as you can, so a black voter was
9 2.5 percent less likely to vote in 2014 than in 2010?

10 THE WITNESS: I would say 2.5 percentage points. So it
11 would go from 60 to 57.5, from 30 to 27.5 based on the other
12 variables. It's percentage points.

13 THE COURT: Okay. And that's a comparison between what
14 you would have predicted for the voter in 2010 versus the
15 behavior in 2014.

16 THE WITNESS: Not precisely. That's comparing black
17 and nonblack voters. The 2010 would be Control C1, which is the
18 third column.

19 THE COURT: Okay.

20 THE WITNESS: Which shows that in 2010 based on the
21 population of registrants who were in the SVRS as of 2006, that
22 African-Americans are actually -- an African-American registrant
23 was more likely to vote in 2010. And most of the other
24 variables are in line with what we observe in 2014 except if you
25 observe the -- if you compare the 2014 probabilities to the 2010

1 probabilities, they all go down, and that signifies these
2 effects are -- these variables are showing effects in 2014 that
3 we don't observe in 2010.

4 THE COURT: Okay. Point that out to me because I'm
5 trying to figure out the impact of the changes and the main one
6 being the imposition of the voter ID requirement.

7 THE WITNESS: Right. If we look at the no ID, that in
8 2010 someone who does not show up as possessing a photo ID is
9 3.5 percentage points less likely to vote than someone who does
10 possess a photo ID. And that reflects the fact that because
11 there are differentials, people who don't possess voter ID are
12 more likely to be African-American -- I mean other evidence
13 shows that they tend to have lower socioeconomic status, so it's
14 not surprising that people who don't possess a photo ID are
15 slightly less likely to vote even if there's no photo ID
16 requirement.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 THE WITNESS: But what you observe if you compare that
19 minus 3.5 percentage points to 2014, it goes up by a factor of
20 five. So it's five times larger reflecting the fact that there
21 is now in 2014, at least among hundreds of thousands of
22 registrants, a belief that photo ID is in effect, and the
23 expectation is that belief would cause many people simply to not
24 present at the polls. So it's not surprising that the effect is
25 significantly larger.

1 MR. SPIVA: And I notice that -- sorry, Your Honor.
2 Did you have another question?

3 THE COURT: No, keep going. I'll fill in with more
4 questions as they come up.

5 BY MR. SPIVA:

6 Q I notice that there's a flip sign, I guess, in the student
7 ward row I believe between Control C1 and Control C2. Can you
8 address that?

9 A So what I think is probably going on there is the -- I am
10 observing presence in a student ward in 2015 -- or 2014 based on
11 where a voter lives in 2015. It makes intuitive sense that
12 populations in student wards are going to be more mobile than
13 other populations because people who go to college and reside in
14 a student ward, they're not going to move there permanently. So
15 there is also an issue that someone who is -- at each point in
16 any of these models, I have removed people who are too young to
17 vote. So if I have someone who is 18 in 2014, they actually are
18 not in the model in 2010 because they would be too young to
19 vote. They would be 14. So I simply removed them because you
20 couldn't say, well, a 14-year-old didn't vote. That would
21 completely bias all of the estimates.

22 And so what I suspect is probably happening with student
23 wards is that we're capturing slightly different populations.
24 That someone who is 18 years old or actually someone who was 22
25 years old in a student ward in 2014, they will still show up as

1 residing in a student ward in 2010 because I'm observing their
2 residence at a snapshot. They could easily have lived someplace
3 else. So I think that's probably what's going on there. I
4 think that's probably one reason for that sign being different.

5 Q Okay. I want to pause on table 8 for a minute, and I want
6 to just ask you to explain the whole student -- how you got to
7 the student ward and the student figures. Let's go to your
8 initial report. We're going to come back to table 8, updated
9 table 8, but let's go to figures 1 and 2. Why don't we start
10 with page 30 of your initial report, figure 1.

11 A So we're switching gears here a little bit because now
12 we're moving from an individual-level analysis to an aggregate
13 analysis to supplement the effects that we've already observed.
14 I had reason to believe that the photo ID law would have a
15 specific effect on students because of the nature of the law,
16 the fact that there are lots of out-of-state students who go to
17 college in Wisconsin, either at one of the UW system campuses or
18 one of the private campuses, so I wanted to identify what those
19 effects would be.

20 So what I did is I began with a list of all four-year --
21 nonprofit four-year colleges and universities that were
22 identified in what's called the Carnegie Classification of
23 Institutions of Higher Education. It's a list that used to be
24 maintained by the Carnegie Foundation. It's now shifted, I
25 believe, to Indiana University, and that shows for each

1 institution the number of students, its address, and so -- and
2 also they also have a list for technical colleges and for-profit
3 colleges which I removed because I was more interested in the
4 four-year campuses.

5 It gave me -- for each institution on that list with an
6 enrollment of more than 500, I had a list of -- I can't remember
7 what the exact number was. I think it was something like 34
8 institutions of higher education, and I had their address. What
9 I did is I geocoded those addresses using a web tool that will
10 convert a street address into a latitude and longitude. I then
11 imported that onto a geographic information software system
12 called Maptitude which I use, and that shows me on a map of
13 Wisconsin where each of these institutions are. I also have in
14 that GIS system a ward map that shows me the boundaries of every
15 ward, every 6,580-some wards in the state, and so now I know
16 where the colleges and universities are. I know which wards
17 they exist in, and so I used a two-step process.

18 I counted as a student ward any ward in which a portion of
19 these campuses were located. And so in the University of
20 Wisconsin, there were wards that actually comprised the dorms
21 and University Heights, and those are all counted. I then moved
22 one by one out -- basically concentric circles out to outlying
23 wards and counted as a student ward any contiguous or nearby
24 ward that had a population of 18 to 24-year-olds in that ward of
25 higher than 10 percent, and I counted that as a student ward.

1 The list of the student wards you can see in my report
2 beginning on page 42 with appendix 1 which shows the wards that
3 I identified as student wards. It shows the college or
4 university, and it shows the percentage of students or the
5 percentage in each of those wards of 18 to 24, and you can see
6 that for most of them sometimes they're all 18 to 24-year-olds.
7 The City of Eau Claire, Ward 20, 95 percent of the residents of
8 that ward are between the ages of 18 to 24, and that's actually
9 part of the UW-Eau Claire campus. So this gives me a measure of
10 which wards are likely to have large populations of students.

11 Q Okay.

12 A And so each registrant who resided in a student ward or
13 showed up as residing in a student ward, that was a dummy
14 variable that took the value of one for each of those
15 registrants. Figures 1 and 2 supplemented that individual
16 result by -- I did a calculation in each ward in the SVRS. I
17 know how many people voted. I know how many people are in the
18 ward. I can, therefore, calculate the turnout, the percentage
19 of people in each ward who voted in 2014.

20 Q What are the pink or red -- my wife claims I'm colorblind.

21 A The maroon "X"s, those are the student wards.

22 Q Okay.

23 A What you can see in 2014, that blob of blue dots in the
24 upper left-hand corner, you know, there's a negative -- the "X"
25 axis here is the percentage of registrants in each ward that

1 don't show up as having an ID. You can see for most of the
2 wards, the middle of that blob is going to be right around 7
3 percentage points. We can consider that roughly the mean. It's
4 pointing in the -- it points downwards so that as you have more
5 registrants in a ward that don't possess an ID, the turnout goes
6 down. It's not a terribly strong relationship, but if you add
7 the student wards which are the maroon "X"s, you begin to see a
8 clear pattern. That in student wards you're likely to have many
9 more people showing up or a much higher percentage of residents
10 in those wards do not show up as possessing an ID, and, again,
11 that's entirely consistent.

12 If you are looking at UW-Madison with large numbers of
13 out-of-state students, Eau Claire, LaCrosse, Beloit,
14 St. Lawrence, universities and colleges that attract large
15 numbers of out-of-state students, an out-of-state student from
16 Illinois, Minnesota, California, New York is unlikely to
17 surrender their driver's license to get a Wisconsin photo ID.
18 And the "Y" axis is turnout, and it shows there's a strong
19 negative relationship. The higher the percentage of registrants
20 in a ward that don't possess an ID, the lower turnout in that
21 ward, and so that's -- normally I wouldn't rely exclusively on
22 an aggregate analysis like this, but this supplements the
23 individual-level analysis. It shows us this is real. That the
24 effects that we observe at the individual level also occur at
25 the aggregate level.

1 And then figure 2 is the same figure for 2010, and there's
2 still a couple of things that are noteworthy here. First, the
3 big blob of blue dots looks more like a circle. It doesn't look
4 like a downward pointed -- an ellipse that points down and to
5 the right. The percentage of ID, and again, this is people who
6 are in the SVRS as of 2010, so I have removed all of the people
7 who were registered after 2010. And what this demonstrates, as
8 I said earlier, it's likely that some of this is due to the fact
9 that the population of registrants in 2010 is probably going to
10 be a little older than it is in 2014 because I have removed lots
11 of people who have registered after 2010, but it demonstrates
12 that there is no real significant effect of ward level ID
13 possession rates and turnout. It's still negative, right, and
14 again that's what you would expect even if there were no -- if
15 photo ID were not an issue because of the demographics of the
16 population that is unlikely to possess or the disparate
17 possession rates of ID, and so I take this as evidence that we
18 see a strong effect in 2014 and a much weaker effect in 2010.

19 Q Okay. Why don't we go back to --

20 THE COURT: I'm going to suggest maybe this is a time
21 where we can take our afternoon break. So why don't we
22 reconvene at 4:35, and then we'll press on at that time.

23 MR. SPIVA: All right. Thanks.

24 (Recess taken 4:19-4:48 p.m.)

25 THE COURT: All right. Let's just pick up where we

1 left off and keep going.

2 BY MR. SPIVA:

3 Q All right. Turn back to updated table 8, which is on page
4 13 of your rebuttal report, Dr. Mayer, PX43. Just wanted to ask
5 you if you can explain the columns in table 8, updated table 8,
6 that are labeled Control C1 2006 to 2010 and Control C2 2006 to
7 2014?

8 A So this is the control that I was referring to before, and
9 I had the wrong columns. Because we know that there's churn in
10 the SVRS, it's important to, as much as you can, try to isolate
11 the effects of the people who have been in the SVRS over a point
12 in time. So Control C1 and Control C2 examine the vote in 2010
13 in Control C1 and then the Control Model C2 is voting in 2014,
14 but these are both for the exact same cohort of people, that
15 these are people who have been in the SVRS for the full range
16 from 2006 all the way to 2015, and we can tell that that's the
17 right cohort if we go back and look at updated table 7, and you
18 look at the row at the bottom which is the "N," that tells me
19 how many people, how many registrants are in the analysis, and
20 you can see for both C1 and C2 it's 1,990,330.

21 THE COURT: So that cohort for C1 and C2 is voters who
22 have been in the SVRS since 2006, which I gather is the
23 inception of the --

24 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

25 THE COURT: -- of the SVRS.

1 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

2 THE COURT: So that's the cohort that's been in there
3 all along. Doesn't mean they actually voted in 2010.

4 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

5 THE COURT: This is just an analysis of voting in --
6 Control C1 is an analysis of their voting in the 2010 election
7 of those voters -- I'll use that; I guess they're really
8 registrants -- who are in the cohort of people who have been in
9 the SVRS since inception, and then Control C2 is your analysis
10 of their voting in the 2014 election, again for that same group
11 of people.

12 THE WITNESS: Precisely.

13 THE COURT: Okay.

14 THE WITNESS: So this is a direct apples-to-apples
15 comparison, and if we look at the -- just to pick out a couple
16 of variables of interest -- if we look at the coefficients for
17 student wards, which is for Control Model C1 it's .09. For
18 Control C2 -- and, remember, these are the same people.

19 THE COURT: Yeah.

20 THE WITNESS: Voting in 2014 the effect of this
21 coefficient goes from --

22 BY MR. SPIVA:

23 Q So you're on table 7, right?

24 A Correct.

25 Q Okay.

1 A Well, actually I guess we can go back to table 8 since now
2 we're looking at probabilities. That's probably the best way to
3 think of it.

4 Q Yeah.

5 A So if we look at the effect of being in a student ward for
6 Control C1, which is voting in 2010, it's plus 2.2 percent, and
7 if we look at those same people in 2014, the effect of being in
8 a student ward goes down. Again, even accounting for the fact
9 that there is going to be some mobility and the fact that we
10 observe someone residing in a student ward in 2014 does not
11 necessarily mean that they actually voted in that same ward in
12 2010. We're observing essentially a cohort effect comparing
13 voting behavior prior to any of these laws going into effect
14 with 2014 with most of them going into effect.

15 THE COURT: And, again, just to be clear on the student
16 ward one because this one is a little, I guess to use the
17 statistical term, funky, these are people who lived in a student
18 ward in 2015.

19 THE WITNESS: Correct.

20 THE COURT: And so we don't know where they lived or
21 where they voted in 2010, and your surmise is that a significant
22 number of them actually didn't live or vote in student wards in
23 the 2010 election.

24 THE WITNESS: That's likely.

25 THE COURT: Okay. All right.

1 THE WITNESS: But if we look at the effects of not
2 having an ID between 2010 and 2014, we observe that they don't
3 have an ID in 2015. It's likely that that didn't change. If
4 they didn't have an ID in 2015, it's likely that they didn't
5 have an ID in 2010. I mean, it's possible that someone could
6 have had an ID in 2010. It expired and it dropped out of the
7 database, but I think that's unlikely.

8 THE COURT: Then you've got this other little tweak
9 that you have to do on the age or on the -- well, for all of the
10 voters, for voters who in 2010 were -- I'm sorry, 2015 -- were
11 not of voting age in the 2010 election, you had to take them
12 out.

13 THE WITNESS: That's correct. So I actually
14 recalculated the ages for each election. So someone who showed
15 up as 24 in 2014, they are 20 in 2010. So I recalculated the
16 ages to account that you go back in time, people get younger.

17 THE COURT: Okay.

18 BY MR. SPIVA:

19 Q Did you figure out how to do that?

20 A It works in Stata. And here you can see that the effects
21 of not possessing an ID, the effect essentially quadruples.
22 It's minus 3.5 percentage points in 2010. It goes up to minus
23 14.5 percent in 2014.

24 THE COURT: Okay. And we're talking about the November
25 election 2014?

1 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

2 THE COURT: Okay. And, again, I'm trying to keep
3 track, voter ID was not actually in effect at that time.

4 THE WITNESS: That's correct, although the evidence is
5 that substantial numbers of people were confused about it, that
6 at a minimum we're talking probably 700,000 registrants believed
7 it was -- mistakenly believed it was in effect, and so really in
8 a way that, you know, 2010 is the control when none of these
9 things were in effect, so it's a way of drawing an inference
10 about the overall effect of these changes between 2010 and 2014.
11 At this point it is still an inference.

12 THE COURT: Yeah. Although again, to be clear about
13 it, it's only the post-registration, unless I'm missing
14 something here --

15 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

16 THE COURT: -- only the post-registration changes that
17 are tested here because you've got to get through the
18 registration hurdles to get into the --

19 THE WITNESS: That's correct. So these would amount to
20 the changes in absentee voting, the reduction in the number of
21 days and hours, the end of late weekend registration and so on.
22 Actually, not late weekend registration. It would be late
23 weekend early voting.

24 THE COURT: Exactly.

25 BY MR. SPIVA:

1 Q And what -- so what is, for instance, the column that's
2 labeled -- the column -- rather the rows labeled "black" and
3 "Hispanic" under those two control groups. What does that tell
4 us?

5 A So those show largely the same pattern, that for the same
6 cohort, and obviously demographics are not going to change --
7 those are constant over the same period -- but the effect of --
8 for a black registrant was actually 3.2 percentage points more
9 likely to vote in 2010 and minus 0.8 percentage points less
10 likely to vote. One of the reasons this -- these numbers or
11 these coefficients are somewhat smaller than for the other
12 models is that we're looking at a cohort who has been in the
13 SVRS. They're going to be older. They're going to have more
14 experience voting, and so you can't directly compare people who
15 have been in the SVRS since 2006 to people who registered for
16 the first time in 2014, but it's a way of basically changing the
17 entry point, and in this case the entry points are the same, so
18 we actually can draw an inference because we're looking at the
19 same people.

20 Q And what's that inference?

21 A The inference is that for most voters, for African-American
22 voters, for voters in students wards, for voters who didn't
23 possess an ID, that there was a significant decrease in their
24 likelihood of voting. For Hispanics it actually goes up a
25 little bit, but that reflects the fact that turnout among

1 Hispanics is dramatically lower than it is for any other major
2 demographic group, and so you would expect the numbers to bounce
3 around a little bit.

4 Q Go back to His Honor's point from a minute ago that this
5 only deals with registered voters. Would you expect there to be
6 some kind of a deterrent effect to registration among people who
7 don't have IDs?

8 A Certainly reasonable to expect that, that the barriers
9 would consist in two ways. One is that we know -- the evidence
10 is that these changes made it more difficult to register. I
11 have some data on the number of people who registered with
12 corroboration. There is evidence that these effects have
13 deterred people, but it's also that if I'm not registered and I
14 know I don't possess an ID and I either -- I know when it is in
15 effect that I need it or I mistakenly believe that I need it,
16 why go to the trouble of registering if I don't believe that I'm
17 eligible to vote. So certainly you would expect to see a
18 deterrent effect at both stages, but, again, at this point in
19 the analysis I'm only observing people who have already
20 surmounted the barriers to registration.

21 THE COURT: I want to make sure I'm not misperceiving
22 this data point here because it's a little -- I guess it's
23 surprising to me because I know that African-American turnout
24 was very high in 2008 and 2012, but this suggests that in 2010 a
25 black member of that cohort that's in Control C1 was actually

1 3.2 percent more likely than a nonblack voter to vote.

2 THE WITNESS: Right. And that could be -- that's a
3 function that we're looking at a particular and unrepresentative
4 cohort of people who have already registered. So if you look at
5 the overall turnout figures among African-Americans -- we're
6 looking at turnout as a percentage of the citizen voting-age
7 population of the voting-eligible population -- that's where
8 you're going to see the effect. I'm looking at turnout only
9 among registered voters, so that differential is going to be
10 somewhat smaller.

11 We saw or heard from Professor Burden yesterday that the
12 gap between black and white turnout has been decreasing over
13 time, and I think 2008 was the first election probably since the
14 1870s, if not ever, where actually it was perfectly
15 proportional, that the African-Americans voted, made up the same
16 percentage of the electorate that they -- the same percentage as
17 their percentage of the citizen voting-age population.

18 THE COURT: All right. Also another point here is that
19 the only variables that are really subject to analysis here are
20 the ones in -- I guess the ones in table 7.

21 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

22 THE COURT: So, for example, income is not --

23 THE WITNESS: That's correct.

24 THE COURT: -- factored in here. Educational
25 achievement isn't factored in here.

1 THE WITNESS: That's correct. In thinking about this,
2 I thought about putting information -- since I know where people
3 live, that I could have put in information about the average
4 income or the median income or the median educational
5 attainment, but where that gets kind of tricky is now I'm sort
6 of mixing individual and aggregate data, and I wanted to keep
7 this as tightly constrained to the individual --

8 THE COURT: But if there were variables that correlated
9 with race, for example, so if educational attainment was
10 negatively correlated with race, this analysis wouldn't
11 distinguish between the effect of educational attainment and
12 race.

13 THE WITNESS: That's correct. Since I don't have any
14 information about the education or income of any of the
15 registrants, I can't make any claims about those effects.

16 THE COURT: Okay.

17 BY MR. SPIVA:

18 Q And that's correct, but that would apply in both 2010 and
19 2014; isn't --

20 A Certainly. Those effects would not -- I don't think those
21 effects would change significantly from one election to the
22 next.

23 Q So could the reduced probabilities of voting of the various
24 groups that you've identified be the result of roll-off or
25 churn?

1 A I don't think so. So we know that people --

2 Q Can you explain what those --

3 A Roll-off is that people move in and out of the SVRS
4 continuously. Again, I'm observing the SVRS at a particular
5 snapshot. I don't know what the SVRS looked like in November of
6 2010. What I can observe is that people who were in the SVRS in
7 2010 who are still in the SVRS in 2014 or 2015, there are
8 certain numbers of people who are going to fall off of the SVRS.
9 They are going to move. They are going to die. They are going
10 to be removed through the list maintenance, and by definition I
11 can't observe them. And we know that happens because if you
12 look at the number of people in the SVRS in 2015 who show up as
13 voting in 2010, that's smaller than the actual number of people
14 who voted by a couple hundred thousand people. But what I am
15 looking at -- so that's one form of roll-off. I can't observe
16 the behavior of people who have dropped out.

17 It is also possible that there are people who remain in the
18 SVRS, so they're still on the voter rolls, but they have done
19 the equivalent of rolling off, but they just haven't been
20 removed yet. It's unlikely for people who have died because the
21 GAB routinely does matching to remove people who have died.
22 They remove people who have been convicted of felonies. But,
23 you know, people move. Someone could move out of state and not
24 update their registration. But I don't think that's going to be
25 a huge number of people, and the only way that would make a

1 difference is if the propensity to roll off the SVRS is
2 correlated with an underlying propensity to vote.

3 So if people remain on the SVRS in 2014 even though they
4 are not going to vote, that the people who are in that category
5 are less likely to vote than the people who stay on the SVRS,
6 and I don't think the evidence is conclusive that that's what's
7 going on. We know that there are lots of voters who roll off
8 the SVRS because we can actually compute that directly. We know
9 that nonvoters roll off the SVRS. But what -- I've already
10 removed everybody who has entered the SVRS after the election,
11 so I've already controlled for one problem, and the only way
12 that this would have a significant effect is if for some subset
13 of the SVRS that wasn't able to vote in 2014 was somehow able to
14 vote in 2010, and to the extent that the roll-off is going to be
15 correlated with the lack of propensity to vote, we would expect
16 that someone would be similarly unlikely to vote in 2010.

17 So I concluded that -- and the other part of that is that
18 if that roll-off was a problem, that you would see a uniform
19 effect. The farther back you go, that you should see a uniform
20 effect with the coefficients either getting larger or smaller as
21 the nonvoters roll off, and that's not what you see. And that's
22 one of the reasons I used a variety of starting and stopping
23 points to try to account for those differences by looking at
24 different cohorts, and what I conclude is that the size of the
25 effects doesn't depend on when people entered the SVRS.

1 Q And you may have just answered this, but you're aware, of
2 course, that Professor McCarty, one of the defense experts, has
3 attributed the probabilities that you're -- that you've put
4 forth as a result of roll-off or churn, and do you have a
5 response?

6 A The difficulty with that argument is that those criticisms
7 are based almost entirely on aggregate turnout where Professor
8 McCarty computed an aggregate percentage turnout in 2010 in a
9 couple of different ways. He weighed it and tried to correct
10 for differences, and there is a real limit to what those kinds
11 of statewide aggregate effects can tell you. I'm making
12 statements about the effects of these changes on individuals.
13 I'm not making -- I do have some statements about aggregate
14 effects at the beginning of the report, but that was just --
15 that was part of the way that I approach large databases. I
16 like to poke at them and see what they're telling me and try to
17 understand the nature of the data. I actually didn't draw any
18 of my conclusions from that aggregate result. All of my
19 conclusions are based on either this individual level of results
20 or some of the ward level analysis that I did.

21 Q What's wrong with drawing conclusions based on aggregate
22 turnout in the way that Professor McCarty did?

23 A If you go back to the state's opening argument, the fact
24 that turnout was high in the April 2016 election, well --

25 Q It was astounding.

1 A So we know, based on the analysis that I have done and the
2 evidence, that these restrictions are not going to affect
3 everybody equally. Most people, based on the possession rates
4 and some of the stories, I would put it probably between 80 and
5 85 percent of the eligible voters, whether people are registered
6 or not, are not going to have difficulty meeting these burdens.
7 They have an ID. They have a driver's license. They have a
8 passport. They have stable residences, and so they are not
9 going to have problems producing the underlying documentation,
10 and we know that.

11 We also know that there are lots of people who are in that
12 category who don't vote. Right? Even in the highest turnout
13 election, you have probably 70 percent, 72 percent of the
14 eligible population casting a ballot. Typically Wisconsin runs
15 about 15 percentage points ahead of the nationwide average. So
16 you still have 30, 35 percent of the eligible population
17 choosing not to vote assuming that they could satisfy the
18 underlying requirements. And that population, the percentage of
19 voters and nonvoters, is going to change. Some presidential
20 elections it's going to go up. Midterm elections and special
21 elections and off-year elections it will go down. People will
22 move in and out based on interest, based on exogenous factors
23 like campaign spending, competitiveness, interest in the
24 campaign.

25 So the way to think about it is this: Let's say I have

1 100,000 nonvoters. These are people who aren't voting, but for
2 one of these exogenous reasons, this 100,000 -- this group of
3 100,000 people, everybody in that group makes a decision that
4 they are going to vote. So they are moving from the nonvoting
5 category into the voting category. Assuming that 85 percent of
6 people in that group will have no problem meeting the
7 requirements, you're going to see turnout go up by 85,000
8 voters. But for that 15,000, whether it's the 9 percent -- 9.8
9 percent of African-Americans who don't possess a driver's
10 license or ID, a student in a ward that doesn't possess a
11 driver's license, the fact that aggregate turnout goes up
12 actually tells you nothing about the burden on any particular
13 individual. And this is what Professor Burden was talking
14 about, the ecological inference problem. That looking at
15 aggregate turnout, turnout could go up by 100,000 or 500,000,
16 and even with that turnout going up, that could just mean that
17 there are actually more people who would like to vote but can't
18 do it because they would like to become voters but they face a
19 burden. They don't have an ID; they don't have stable
20 residencies, and they have trouble producing the underlying
21 documentation.

22 So the fact that aggregate turnout went up between 2010 and
23 2014 or between the 2012 presidential primary and the 2016
24 presidential primary doesn't tell you about the effects on
25 individuals. It's the wrong unit of analysis, and this is why I

1 did the individual-level burden because it doesn't matter what
2 happens to aggregate turnout. You could have aggregate turnout
3 go up, and that just means there are more people that are
4 affected by these things. You can have aggregate turnout go
5 down and have more people affected by these things. And it's
6 well established in the political science literature that the
7 aggregate effect, an individual effect, there's no reason why
8 they actually have to have the same signs, and this is sort of
9 the classic problem of trying to draw inferences about the
10 effects on individuals using just aggregate outcome, and that's
11 why I did the individual-level analysis.

12 THE COURT: Just to follow up on that a little bit. So
13 the exogenous factors that you describe, I'm not sure I
14 understand how those are isolated apart from the demographic
15 categories that you've analyzed.

16 THE WITNESS: So --

17 THE COURT: Because I'm looking at 2010. I'm looking
18 at 2014. There aren't any obvious explanations such as the
19 explanation for the astounding voter turnout in the 2016
20 presidential primary here in Wisconsin. So they're a huge
21 exogenous factor because both parties had very competitive
22 primary races late enough into the season to make Wisconsin
23 matter on both sides of the aisle, so that's going to drive
24 participation up. But when I look here at 2010 and 2014,
25 nothing comes to mind sort of dramatically, but those effects

1 might still have been there, but I don't see how you would
2 ferret them out.

3 THE WITNESS: Well, because this is not designed to
4 ferret out overall turnout. This is not a study of aggregate
5 turnout.

6 THE COURT: I understand that, but it's still the
7 things that affected an individual's decision to vote in 2010
8 compared to 2014 still involve those factors that relate to
9 their interest in the election and their perceived importance of
10 the election between those two, and, again, like I said, there's
11 nothing obvious about the difference between 2010 and 2014. One
12 of our assumptions here in our -- in the evidence that's been
13 presented is that those elections are kind of roughly in parity
14 with the exception of some changes in the voting regime, but, in
15 fact, there might be differences in interest that mattered to
16 voters, and I'm not sure how we would have factored that out.

17 THE WITNESS: I would say this, that through this
18 analysis I don't think that I would be able to say that these
19 effects you would expect to see based on aggregate because we're
20 looking at the segment of people who have entered the SVRS at a
21 particular point in time, and in 2014 you saw lots of people
22 enter into the registration system because of interest, but I'm
23 not capturing them here because I'm only looking at people who
24 entered the SVRS prior to the 2014 election for precisely that
25 reason. If I'm looking at the effect of these variables just

1 looking at that election, I don't have any voting history.

2 THE COURT: Right.

3 THE WITNESS: I can't control for anything that has
4 changed. All I'm looking for or all I'm able to observe is the
5 behavior at that point in time. And this analysis though I'm
6 able to back up and compare the outcomes that we observe in 2014
7 to what we observe in previous elections. Now, a change in
8 aggregate turnout where you have more people registering, that
9 in a way I've already controlled for that because -- at least
10 partly because I don't observe anything about the people who
11 have entered in to --

12 THE COURT: Right.

13 THE WITNESS: -- the system as of 2014. All I have or
14 what I have is people who have entered at some previous point.
15 I can examine their behavior in the June recall. I can examine
16 their behavior in 2010, the gubernatorial election. I also
17 don't have anything in here about the presidential elections
18 because there's nothing to compare it to. I'd be looking at
19 2012, and so I think the --

20 THE COURT: So the control really is that you have
21 somewhat habituated voters here in the cohorts that are your
22 Control C1 and Control C2 because those people have been in the
23 system for a long time. So you're taking out the impact of
24 voters who have registered for the first time so that they could
25 vote in 2014, for example.

1 THE WITNESS: Correct. Now, as we will see when we get
2 to the data from 2016, we actually do have concrete evidence of
3 what happened there where there were people who were registered
4 who were actually barred from voting because they didn't have an
5 ID.

6 THE COURT: Right.

7 THE WITNESS: And so, again, these are inferences. We
8 know that some things change, and we know that voters believe
9 that other things had changed, but this type of analysis given
10 the limits of the data -- I don't have data on educational
11 attainment and so forth.

12 THE COURT: Right.

13 THE WITNESS: I am, because of the data, limited to
14 these demographic variables, but the effects that I observe are
15 entirely consistent with other studies that actually have taken
16 those things into account. So I'm -- I haven't captured
17 everything, but I am confident that these effects that I -- that
18 we are observing are real, and they're not due to any underlying
19 artifact of the modeling or the cohorts or the roll-off or
20 roll-on. I have attempted to control for each of those things
21 in the course of doing this analysis.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 BY MR. SPIVA:

24 Q What is the literature on this issue? Is there a consensus
25 or --

1 A I would regard the recent evidence as not consensus as it's
2 almost unanimous. Just to give you one example, there's just --
3 actually two examples. The Government Accountability Office did
4 a study of aggregate turnout comparing turnout in states with
5 strict voter ID to turnout in states without strict voter ID,
6 and they concluded that strict voter ID has a depressive effect
7 that actually is disproportionate on racial minorities and young
8 people.

9 Another piece of evidence is a study that Professor Hood
10 did, the defense expert. His study, which was actually an
11 individual-level study of voter ID in Georgia, and I cited it in
12 my rebuttal report, his own work concludes that voter ID
13 depresses turnout and has specific depressive effect on
14 particular populations so --

15 Q Is that the "Much Ado About Nothing?" article --

16 A That's correct. So there was a literature that emerged in
17 2006 to 2008, 2009, when these laws -- some of these laws had
18 just gone into effect. You had really Indiana was the only
19 state that had a strict voter ID, and at that point scholars
20 looked at the issue and concluded that there really wasn't
21 enough data to make a conclusive determination. That is no
22 longer true. We have data from a large number of states with
23 strict voter ID. We have new data on additional election
24 cycles. I would characterize the contemporary literature as
25 virtually unanimous that photo ID laws depress turnout, and they

1 depress turnout particularly among -- have a disparate effect on
2 particular racial and demographic minorities.

3 Q Now, I just want to go back to this issue of the fact that
4 the voter ID law wasn't in effect in the 2014 election because
5 of the Supreme Court injunction at the time. So can you explain
6 again how you can attribute an effect to it given that it wasn't
7 in place?

8 A So sitting here, without reading the report, I don't think
9 I could actually characterize the sequence of events, but the
10 shorthand is that it was upheld and joined, reversed. I mean,
11 it's a complicated sequence of events --

12 Q Which you do lay out in your --

13 A I do. The result is I cited a Marquette poll from October
14 of 2014, actually I think it was about 54 percent of registered
15 voters said they believed that they would have to show photo ID,
16 and that applied to the SVRS of about 3.4 million people, you're
17 looking at 1.7 million registered voters who believed they would
18 have to show photo ID. I know that there was a subsequent poll
19 taken later in October that showed it was closer to -- it was
20 actually about 25 percent said they believed it was in effect or
21 they weren't sure. But even if it's 20 percent or 25 percent,
22 you're still talking about 750,000, 800,000 registered voters
23 who believed that the photo ID law was in effect.

24 And so if anything, what this means is that the effects
25 that I observe are actually smaller than what they would be if

1 you actually observe what happened once the law was into effect.
2 I didn't have the data to do the analysis for April 2016, but I
3 am certain that if I were able to replicate the analysis here,
4 it would show that the effect was at least as large, probably
5 larger, because we now know that there are hundreds of people,
6 probably thousands, who were actively prohibited or
7 disenfranchised and simply unable to cast a ballot.

8 Q Let me just pause and see that -- I don't think there's any
9 objection to PX43, which is Dr. Mayer's rebuttal report.

10 MR. JOHNSON-KARP: No objection.

11 THE COURT: Okay. I'll admit that too.

12 MR. SPIVA: Thank you.

13 BY MR. SPIVA:

14 Q Dr. Hood points to some data from elections in 2015. Did
15 you look at that data or do you think that it's appropriate to
16 draw any inferences based on those elections?

17 A So Professor Hood is arguing, and this is --

18 Q Are you looking for it in your rebuttal report?

19 A Yes. This is page -- Professor Hood argues that evidence
20 from elections in 2015, again, this was -- that he examined a
21 series of elections that were held in 2015 after the photo ID
22 law had gone into effect and argued that because there were only
23 six provisional ballots that were issued in these elections,
24 that that's evidence that the law was not preventing anybody
25 from voting.

1 Now, I pointed out in my report that there are two errors
2 with that. One is an inferential error, that these special
3 elections were uniformly tiny turnout elections. Some of them,
4 you know, a few thousand people. These were special elections,
5 school board referenda, school board elections. I think the
6 highest turnout election was an assembly special election where
7 I think you had 15 percent turnout, and it's well known in the
8 literature that people who -- people who turn out in these
9 elections are almost always going to be the most highly
10 motivated and engaged voters. I mean, I'm a highly motivated
11 and engaged voter, and there are some school board elections
12 that I haven't voted in. And so the people who are most likely
13 to vote in these elections are the ones who are -- these are the
14 most engaged, the most education, highest income. They're more
15 likely than not to have -- they're very likely to have one of
16 the forms of qualifying IDs. So looking at these special
17 elections really tells you nothing about the effect.

18 Professor Hood, again in his own work, has argued that
19 looking at provisional ballots is the wrong indicator because it
20 doesn't tell you anything about people who might want to vote
21 but decide they're not even going to present at the polls
22 because they know they don't have an ID, why even bother, and he
23 argued that. It was actually in the same "Much Ado About
24 Nothing?" article. So the way I characterized it in my report
25 is there's an inferential error, which is these elections don't

1 allow you to draw any inferences about what's going to happen in
2 a presidential primary or in an on-year presidential election,
3 and the other is they don't tell you anything about people who
4 simply don't present at the polls, and the way that you can tell
5 that is he phrases his claim that Act 23 does not prevent voters
6 from casting ballots, applies to individuals, quote,
7 participating in these elections.

8 So he's limiting his inference to the people who have
9 already chosen to come out, and, you know, the fact is in his
10 own published work he's argued that this is the wrong indicator,
11 and I think there's very clear and compelling evidence from
12 the -- particularly the April 2016 primary where the number of
13 provisional ballots skyrocketed to -- I don't think that there
14 has ever been -- actually I'm quite confident that the
15 provisional ballots only became a thing after the Help America
16 Vote Act. The number of provisional ballots we saw in April
17 2016 is five, six, seven times as many as we have seen in recent
18 even presidential elections. So I regard that inference as
19 utterly incorrect.

20 Q And let me just pause for a minute and ask you by way of
21 your background, you do have a great deal of experience studying
22 Wisconsin elections, election administration --

23 A That's correct.

24 Q Okay. And can you just give a couple of examples?

25 A I am part of a group of scholars that since I think

1 probably 2009 has been actively engaged in studying elections.
2 I was -- I joined a group actually headed by Professor Burden
3 that we worked with the Government Accountability Board with a
4 contract, a grant that they received from the Election
5 Assistance Commission to study election administration processes
6 and advise them on compliance with reporting requirements. We
7 did a survey of every local election official in the state,
8 which is over 1,800 election officials. We've published a
9 number of peer-reviewed articles on election administration
10 looking at the effect of election laws on turnout, the effect of
11 administrative burdens, the perceptions of local election
12 officials and how they perceive the effects, the partisan
13 consequences of election reform. I have been actively involved
14 in expert witness work on elections both in redistricting -- in
15 2011 I was retained by the Prosser for Supreme Court campaign
16 after the election to advise them on the underlying
17 probabilities of the recount process, which they went and
18 advised them about indicators that would suggest that something
19 had gone wrong, something was awry, and there was nothing. So
20 I've been studying Wisconsin elections since at least 1995 and
21 have been studying specifically election administration for
22 probably the last eight years.

23 Q Okay. And just by the way, is Prosser a Republican or a
24 Democrat?

25 A Well, the Supreme Court races are partisan, but when he was

1 in the state legislature, I believe he was a Republican.

2 Q And so what is Wisconsin's experience historically with
3 provisional ballots in terms of numbers?

4 A Provisional ballots were implemented in the Help America
5 Vote Act primarily because of the experience in the 2000
6 presidential election when many thousands of voters, especially
7 in Florida which was decisive in that election, who presented at
8 the polls believing that they were registered, and for a variety
9 of reasons did not show up on the rolls. They had been purged.
10 They did not appear as registered, and there was a tremendous
11 controversy about that.

12 The Help America Vote Act established a requirement that
13 states offer voters provisional ballots when there is a dispute
14 over their eligibility. In most states the disputes involve
15 whether someone is correctly registered or is accurately
16 registered, and so in states like Ohio where you don't have
17 election day registration, you can see tens of thousands, some
18 places hundreds of thousands of provisional ballots where people
19 appear at the wrong precinct, they appear believing that they
20 are registered when they are not, and instead of simply turning
21 them away, they are allowed to vote provisionally and given some
22 time, it varies by state, but are given some time after the
23 election has occurred to correct the problems.

24 In most cases they can't. Most of the time provisional
25 ballots are not counted, but provisional ballots have never been

1 a real issue in Wisconsin because if you present at the polls
2 believing that you're registered and you're not and you're not,
3 you register on election day. And so whereas other states would
4 have tens of thousands of provisional ballots because of
5 disputes over eligibility, I think in the 2014 gubernatorial
6 election statewide, which had I think 2.1 million votes cast, I
7 think there were 54. I know in the City of Madison in 2014 with
8 131 -- 121,000 votes cast, there was one provisional ballot
9 because the only reason for a provisional ballot would be for
10 someone who can't prove their residence, and so in those cases
11 if they didn't have the documentation and could not produce it,
12 they would vote provisionally and they would have three days
13 after the election to resolve that, to correct, to cure their
14 provisional ballot. And so we had virtually none, and there was
15 no -- it was just not an issue. Well, now we do.

16 Q Okay. So is there any subsequent evidence of the effects
17 of these laws, and particularly the voter ID law, from the more
18 recent elections?

19 A So there are two pieces of evidence: One relating solely
20 to Madison which is from the February 2016 Supreme Court
21 primary, and the other is from the April 2016 presidential
22 preference primary.

23 Q Okay. What about the Madison example?

24 A So in Madison in February -- I don't know the exact date,
25 but it was a February Supreme Court primary. I think there

1 were -- there was a total of 38,000 ballots cast for that
2 election in Madison. It was a low turnout affair. And they
3 had, by my count, 28 provisional ballots. I think Maribeth
4 Witzel-Behl said 23, but it's immaterial. I'm working from
5 recollection here. So we have an election that in 2014 you had
6 121,000 ballots cast, 1 provisional ballot. Now you have an
7 election where there was one-quarter the number of ballots cast
8 but 23 times the number of provisional ballots, and almost all
9 of them were photo ID related. I did not -- I don't know or did
10 not know how many of them had actually been counted, but she
11 testified today that most of them -- I think only six of them
12 were actually cured. So this is concrete evidence that people
13 are presenting at the polls, and they're unable to cast a ballot
14 because they don't have photo ID. Other evidence --

15 Q Let me ask you this -- talking about the April 5th primary?

16 A The April 5th presidential primary gives you even more
17 evidence because that's a state -- we now have statewide
18 figures. I actually don't know off the top of my head --

19 Q Put up the charts. Can we put up PX463, and this is one of
20 the ones that we sent you yesterday. I don't know if there's an
21 objection, but maybe before you answer that I'll ask you where
22 did the information in this table come from?

23 A I received data that was represented as being from the GAB,
24 so it reflects the reporting of the local clerks to the GAB of
25 the number of provisional ballots that they issued in the April

1 5th, 2016, primary. It's actually a list of every single one
2 with the voter, the address, the reason for the provisional
3 ballot, and whether the ballot was ultimately counted or
4 rejected.

5 THE COURT: And this is from the GAB?

6 THE WITNESS: This is from the GAB. This chart is
7 actually collapsed so the GAB -- it was a spreadsheet with all
8 375 individuals who cast provisional ballots, and for each
9 individual it had their name, first name, last name. For about
10 half of them it had their address. I think for 183 of the 375
11 it actually had data for address. It had their county, the
12 reason for the provisional ballot, and whether it was counted or
13 rejected.

14 BY MR. SPIVA:

15 Q Just to be clear, this was a document that was produced in
16 discovery in this case --

17 A I believe so. And so what I did is I --

18 THE COURT: Hold on. Is there any objection to the
19 chart?

20 MR. KAWSKI: There are no objections.

21 THE COURT: Okay. I'll admit the chart.

22 BY MR. SPIVA:

23 Q Why don't you go ahead and maybe explain what the chart
24 shows, and if we can make that a little bigger, that would be
25 great.

1 A So what I did is I took that spreadsheet and imported it
2 into a statistical package that I use that I can manipulate it,
3 and I collapsed this -- that data to give me figures on how
4 many -- on the distribution of provisional ballots based on the
5 reason. And so these are just -- this is just data that was
6 entered by local clerks. So there were 375 provisional ballots,
7 which I actually don't believe is -- I think that's a
8 significant undercount. I don't think that captures every
9 provisional ballot that was issued, but we'll take that as the
10 lower bound of that.

11 Q Why do you suspect it doesn't capture the total universe?

12 A Well, for a couple of reasons. One is that if you look at
13 that data and collapse it by municipality, there was only
14 provisional ballot data in 105 of the state's 1,870-odd
15 municipalities. There were also some unusual patterns. So
16 Madison had I think it was 123 provisional ballots, which was
17 discussed this morning. So Madison has about 5 percent -- about
18 7 percent of the statewide number of registered voters, and it
19 doesn't make sense that Madison would have one-third of the
20 provisional ballots. There was a low number of provisional
21 ballots that was issued in Milwaukee. Milwaukee has a much
22 larger -- four times the size of Madison, but they only had 54
23 provisional ballots, and so I think there were some
24 inconsistencies across municipalities with the degree to which
25 provisional ballots were offered, but we can work with this as

1 the lower bound.

2 Q Okay. So what does PX463 --

3 A So it shows of the 375 provisional ballots, about 87
4 percent of them were related to photo ID. So we have the 288
5 provisional ballots that were listed as being offered for photo
6 ID. We have 34 provisional ballots in the third line issued
7 because of Wisconsin driver's license. Now, the file doesn't
8 specify what this means, but it's a reasonable inference that
9 this is photo ID related, that someone presented -- the way in
10 which data is reported from clerks to the GAB either through the
11 incident reports or the inspectors' reports from what GAB calls
12 the GAB 190s, clerks enter data in inconsistent ways. One clerk
13 might have said they didn't have a photo ID; someone else would
14 have said they don't have a Wisconsin driver's license even
15 though that's photo ID related. 9 people were issued a photo
16 ID -- a provisional ballot because of photo ID, Wisconsin
17 driver's license. So we have 77 percent, 10 percent, which is
18 87 percent plus 2.4 -- basically have 87 percent of the
19 provisional ballots were issued basically because the person,
20 the registrant, the voter, did not have a photo ID.

21 The other three categories are related to documentary proof
22 of residence. We have the 38 people for proof of residence. We
23 have 5 people with a combination of proof of residence and photo
24 ID. One person Wisconsin driver's license, proof of residence.
25 If you add up 38, 5, and 1, that gives you 44, and that's

1 roughly consistent with the number of provisional ballots that
2 you would have expected in a Wisconsin election that were --
3 that were -- what we can call typical based on the pattern.

4 So we know that there were three hundred -- let's add it
5 up. 43 -- 331 people who were unable to cast a regular ballot
6 because they didn't have a photo ID, and this is documented.
7 These are real people. These are people who presented at the
8 polls. These are people who were not able to cast a ballot
9 because they didn't have a photo ID.

10 Q Isn't that a small percentage though of the total number of
11 people who voted?

12 A It's a small percentage of the 1.6 million people who
13 voted, but if you're in this category and you're
14 disenfranchised, it's not a small number. And you'll hear me
15 say this again, but you disenfranchise someone from an election,
16 prohibit them from voting, you can't unring that bell. There's
17 no way to remedy that. There's no way to make that person
18 whole. They've been disenfranchised. They wanted to vote.
19 They were prevented from voting because of the photo ID
20 requirement.

21 THE COURT: Let me just ask one thing. I assume -- let
22 me put it this way. I'm inferring from your comments that you
23 assume that they were all actually eligible to vote or that they
24 were all entitled to vote, just lacked the ID. Entitled in the
25 sense that they were eligible citizens.

1 THE WITNESS: Well, I am drawing the inference if the
2 reason they were issued a photo ID -- provisional ballot was for
3 photo ID, I'm drawing the inference that they were actually
4 registered because for people who have proof of residence
5 problems, they were not accurately registered. In fact, I'll
6 show data in a second that there are large -- there are a number
7 of voters who have been voting for decades who have been in the
8 SVRS for years who were unable to have their -- unable to vote.
9 Now, it's true that some of these votes were ultimately counted.
10 I have data on the final status of these votes, and about 30
11 percent of them --

12 MR. SPIVA: Why don't we put up plaintiffs' exhibit
13 464.

14 THE COURT: Is there going to be an objection to 464?

15 MR. JOHNSON-KARP: No objection.

16 THE COURT: Okay. That's admitted.

17 THE WITNESS: So of the 375 provisional ballots, this
18 shows the final status. 108 of them were counted, so someone
19 voted provisionally and was able to resolve the underlying
20 problem. 69 percent were not counted, and, again, this is in
21 line with the pattern in other states. Most provisional ballots
22 are not counted. Of the 379, there were 9 that were not listed
23 as ultimately resolved, so we don't know whether these folks
24 were counted or not.

25 BY MR. SPIVA:

1 Q And let me ask if we could put up -- well, actually, two
2 questions. Is there literature on whether this is typical in
3 terms of whether most provisional ballots are ultimately
4 counted?

5 A It is. It's mentioned that the literature -- people who
6 have examined the ultimate status of provisional ballots in
7 other states show the same type of pattern. It depends on the
8 state. Sometimes you'll get a slightly higher percentage
9 counted. Sometimes you'll get a slightly lower percentage
10 counted, but the literature is quite clear that most provisional
11 ballots wind up being rejected.

12 Q And are there additional reasons beyond people maybe just
13 not -- I shouldn't say just, but people not being able to come
14 back with a valid ID, an acceptable ID, why a provisional ballot
15 might be rejected?

16 A Well, ultimately if a provisional voter is not able to
17 overcome the objection. All right? They might come -- some
18 people clearly are going to vote provisionally and not bother
19 because it's an additional step that they have to go to the city
20 clerk's office.

21 Q They don't sign --

22 A That was the story today, that someone failed to sign their
23 provisional ballot, and that's one that can't be cured.

24 Q Even if they come back?

25 A Even if they come back. I think Maribeth Witzel-Behl said

1 this person did come back, and because they hadn't signed it,
2 they were unable to count it.

3 Q And that's an impediment that's not faced by somebody
4 casting a regular ballot?

5 A That's correct. A regular ballot in Madison at least, we
6 have a polling place, optical scan. You cast your ballot. You
7 insert it into the machine, and you're done.

8 Q Let me ask if we can put up plaintiffs' exhibit 466.
9 Actually did we already do -- wait a second. Can you take that
10 down for a minute? Let me ask that we put up 465, please,
11 plaintiffs' exhibit 465. Can you explain what this represents?

12 A Because I had information on each individual voter, for
13 about half of them, so for about half of the provisional voters,
14 I had enough data that I could try to link them with their
15 record in the Statewide Voter Registration System. I had their
16 name. I had their address. And I also had that same data in
17 the SVRS. So -- and because I had a relatively small number of
18 matches, I could combine an automated process with a manual
19 process to correct problems. So for about half of the
20 registrants or half --

21 THE COURT: Let me find out about the status of
22 these -- is there an objection to this exhibit?

23 MR. JOHNSON-KARP: No objection.

24 THE COURT: Okay. Good. That's admitted.

25 THE WITNESS: So I matched on the first name, last

1 name, and zip code of the provisional voter. There were no
2 duplicates on that, so each person was unique, first name, last
3 name, zip code. And I matched them to the equivalent record in
4 the SVRS which gave me a list of I think 163 matches. And
5 because I also had the address of the provisional voter and the
6 registered voter, I could go in and manually compare it and make
7 sure that those weren't duplicated, and there were some
8 duplicates. Sometimes there were two people with the same name
9 and zip code in the SVRS, but the addresses didn't match, and I
10 eliminated that. So this is the subset of people in the SVRS or
11 the subset of provisional voters who voted provisionally solely
12 because they had no photo ID. So I'm actually not even counting
13 the people who voted provisionally because they didn't have a
14 Wisconsin driver's license. I'm limiting to that first category
15 of 288 people.

16 This is probably half of the actual number because for half
17 of the provisional voters, the address field was blank. And so
18 I had no way of knowing who they were, and even if they matched
19 to someone with that same name, I didn't have any way of
20 evaluating whether that was the same person, so I'm eliminating
21 that. So I anticipate -- there's no reason to expect --
22 there was no pattern to the existence of an address by county or
23 anything else -- there's no reason to expect that to be any
24 different. So I suspect you can reasonably double these to get
25 the full effect.

1 And what this shows, of the 116 people who are in the SVRS
2 who voted provisionally in April because of no photo ID, it
3 shows that actually 59 percent of them actually have a driver's
4 license or photo ID, and this is -- this is consistent with what
5 other studies have shown, that a lot of people who actually
6 possess a qualifying ID incorrectly believe that they don't, and
7 so they -- either they don't bring it or they might have lost
8 it, and so, you know, proportionately the people who don't
9 possess a driver's license, that's 8.4 percent of the registered
10 voters. We see that they're overrepresented by a factor of
11 five, but in terms of absolute numbers, there are more people
12 who voted provisionally for photo ID who actually possessed an
13 ID.

14 So this is collateral damage of photo ID laws, that they
15 prevent people who not only don't have a photo ID, there are
16 people who actually do have a qualifying ID who believe in part,
17 one reason -- Maribeth talked about that today -- that they
18 mistakenly believe it has to show their accurate address or
19 they've lost it or for whatever reason. And there are other
20 studies that have found similar phenomenon, that there are
21 people who believe they don't have an ID, but if you drill down
22 and ask them about specific forms of ID that they possess, they
23 actually do. But they are still -- they still face a burden in
24 casting a ballot.

25 MR. SPIVA: So I'm going to move to another exhibit,

1 but before we put it up, it's plaintiffs' exhibit 466. I don't
2 know if there's a way to put it up for the judge and not put it
3 up on the screen.

4 THE COURT: There is.

5 MR. SPIVA: And I guess there are two issues, Your
6 Honor. One, I wanted to see if there's an objection. This data
7 came from the same source.

8 THE COURT: Is this up for counsel?

9 MR. KAWSKI: We're getting there. I think the iPad may
10 have died.

11 MR. SPIVA: I have a paper copy.

12 MR. JOHNSON-KARP: If you've got one, I'll take it.

13 MR. SPIVA: Would you like a paper copy, Your Honor?

14 THE COURT: Sure. Easier to manage. Thank you.

15 MR. SPIVA: Do you want one?

16 THE WITNESS: I can't see it.

17 MR. SPIVA: That's true. That's a public monitor. So
18 I will represent to counsel that this, you know, came from the
19 same sources, the list of provisional ballots that GAB produced
20 and the SVRS database, so I don't know if there's an objection.

21 THE COURT: Any objection?

22 MR. JOHNSON-KARP: No objection.

23 THE COURT: All right. 466 is admitted.

24 MR. SPIVA: Then the other issue I'll raise is just
25 that under the protective order, this should be confidential,

1 and I don't want to waste a lot of time, you know, dealing with
2 this now, but most of the fields in here are actually publicly
3 available in the SVRS other than date of birth, which appears I
4 think on the second page of the exhibit. You know, for now I'm
5 perfectly happy to keep it off the public screen, but I just
6 wanted to raise that issue.

7 THE COURT: The date of birth appears on the -- so this
8 is a spreadsheet that would have many columns that would extend
9 over pages, so the last page we have voters' names and addresses
10 here, and it looks like the birth date appears in the last
11 column, so I don't see any problem with -- I don't know what
12 pages you want to show, but I don't see any problem with showing
13 this first page.

14 MR. SPIVA: Yeah. That was my point. I don't know if
15 there's --

16 THE COURT: That sounds good. Just don't show the
17 third page.

18 MR. SPIVA: Yeah. Okay.

19 THE COURT: Should be some reward for hanging in here
20 until --

21 MR. SPIVA: I don't know if that's a reward actually.

22 THE COURT: Okay.

23 BY MR. SPIVA:

24 Q So these -- can you explain what this is?

25 A This is the result of the matching process, and, again,

1 this is only about half of the people who actually voted
2 provisionally because -- and for about half of the provisional
3 votes I don't have address data, so I didn't feel comfortable
4 even attempting to match. So these are 35 people who voted
5 provisionally solely because they don't possess -- because they
6 didn't possess a photo ID who show up in my original matching
7 analysis linking the SVRS to the DOT as not possessing a
8 driver's license or photo ID whose provisional ballots were
9 rejected.

10 So these 35 people were unambiguously disenfranchised
11 because they don't possess a photo ID. They had to vote
12 provisionally because they don't have a photo ID, and their
13 provisional ballots were rejected because they don't have a
14 photo ID. So this is a list of 35 people, and again if I had
15 address data for everybody, I suspect this list would be twice
16 as large. These people were literally disenfranchised in the
17 presidential primary.

18 THE COURT: But these people were matched in the
19 driver's license database?

20 THE WITNESS: Well, these are people who didn't match.
21 So the variable "no ID" indicates that they did not show up in
22 the Department of Transportation database. So these are not
23 people who show up as having a driver's license. So -- and
24 because of the feature of the SVRS, I have their voter history,
25 so I can go back and look at how many times they voted between

1 February of 2006 when the SVRS was created --

2 BY MR. SPIVA:

3 Q Is there a column that reflects that?

4 A There is. That's the third from the right that says
5 "Number of Times Voted Since 2006."

6 Q Can we make that bigger, please? That column.

7 A And so we can see there's one person who -- one zero. So
8 this is a person who had never voted prior to April -- had never
9 voted between 2006 and 2014. A number of people had voted once
10 in either 2012 or 2014, but you can see there's some people --
11 one person voted 10 times. One person had voted 11 times.
12 Another person 10 times. One person 15 times, 10, 13 times, 8
13 times.

14 So these are people who had a long history of voting and
15 also point out that if you look at the application date, which
16 is the -- a blank application date signifies that these people
17 were in the SVRS at the point at which it was created. So these
18 are people who had been registered at least since 2006, and in
19 many cases, given their ages, there were people who were in
20 their 50s, 60s, 70s, and 80s on this list. Presumably people
21 had been voting for decades. So this is concrete evidence of
22 literal disenfranchisement for no other reason than the photo ID
23 requirement.

24 Q Are there additional people who didn't cure their
25 provisional ballots even though they had a DOT ID?

1 A There are -- I want to make one other point. So that we
2 know that there are people who voted provisionally and whose
3 ballots were not cured were not on this list, including the
4 gentleman who testified earlier today. He is actually --

5 Q Mr. Switlick?

6 A Mr. Switlick. He's actually on the list of provisional
7 ballots, but the address fields in that file is blank. So I was
8 not able to link him here, and I think it's a reasonable
9 inference that that will also be true for many of the people who
10 do not have an address and would not be on this list.

11 Q What would you say in terms of -- to the suggestion that
12 this is such a small number that it really -- it just suggests
13 kind of a hiccup with the system?

14 A Well, if you've been voting for decades and suddenly you
15 can't vote, that's not a hiccup to you, and that's the wrong
16 indicator. There's no question that there are people who have
17 been disenfranchised, and given the fact that in my view looking
18 at the literature and in the view of most, if not all, political
19 scientists who have looked at this issue, that there's no reason
20 for these laws. They don't cure any problem. They don't
21 prevent anything that happens. They don't increase confidence
22 in the electoral process. They are pure deadweight. They don't
23 do anything except make it more difficult to vote, and in this
24 case preventing people from voting, and so even on a pure
25 balance of interests, we have purported yet false claims about

1 the purpose of these laws and the things that they do against
2 actual evidence of individuals being disenfranchised, and this
3 is the tip of the iceberg.

4 That we know that there are people who voted provisionally
5 whose ballots were not cured who are not on this list. We know
6 that there are people who present at the polls who are given the
7 option of a provisional ballot and who walk away. We know -- we
8 can't observe, but there is good evidence that people will fail
9 to present. We know that there are people who have IDs who
10 present at the polls and are given a provisional ballot which is
11 not counted because for whatever reason they don't cure their
12 ballots. The list -- the number of people who were
13 disenfranchised is not 35. The number of people who were
14 disenfranchised is at least one order of magnitude, probably
15 several orders of magnitude, greater than this, and that's just
16 from what we can directly observe or directly infer. That's not
17 even making any guesses about the number of people who are
18 ultimately deterred from even presenting at the polls.

19 Q You've written on and studied the incidents of in-person
20 voter fraud in the United States?

21 A I have.

22 Q And how does even the 35 number compare with the evidence
23 of incidents of in-person voter impersonation fraud?

24 MR. JOHNSON-KARP: I'm going to object as beyond the
25 scope of this expert's opinion.

1 MR. SPIVA: I think he addressed this in his rebuttal.

2 THE COURT: Well, point me to a hook here. I think
3 it's an issue that has been raised, but if he's got this
4 opinion, he should have disclosed it.

5 MR. SPIVA: I think he cited his article -- I can ask
6 him about it -- but on page 6 of his rebuttal report,
7 plaintiffs' exhibit 43, he cites footnote 21, "The academic
8 literature is virtually unanimous that the rate of vote fraud
9 through impersonation is vanishingly small," and he actually
10 cites one of his own articles on the issue.

11 THE COURT: Okay. Good enough. I'll overrule that
12 objection. Go ahead and tell me what you have to say.

13 BY MR. SPIVA:

14 Q How do you think that number, the 35 disenfranchised
15 voters, compares to the number of cases of fraud?

16 A Given that the number of cases of voter impersonation in
17 Wisconsin that would be -- would have been prevented by a voter
18 ID is for all practical purposes zero, that this vastly exceeds
19 that. Again, Professor Minnite has written about that. I
20 presume she will testify about that on Friday. There is
21 virtually zero evidence of anything other than the most
22 minuscule numbers of amounts of voter impersonation.

23 Virtually every case of voter fraud that I have seen in
24 Wisconsin in the course of my own work and expert witness work
25 involves vote fraud that would not be prevented by a voter ID.

1 Felons voting improperly. People voting absentee and then at
2 the polls. People with photo ID voting multiple times. There
3 is -- I mean, the only reason I say virtually instead of
4 absolutely is that there is some minuscule possibility that
5 there might be a vanishingly small number of incidents, but for
6 all practical purposes, the degree of voter impersonation fraud
7 is essentially zero.

8 Q And is there any reputable academic who has written any
9 kind of a peer-reviewed study that argues that there is a large
10 incidence of fraud, of in-person voter impersonation fraud?

11 A Not what I would consider to be a credible social scientist
12 in a credible peer-reviewed journal. It's very easy to make
13 claims, and people make claims all the time, and you see that
14 here. Someone who knows a guy who knows a guy who is absolutely
15 convinced you have busloads of Chicago folks rolling into
16 Kenosha casting fraudulent ballots. It doesn't happen, and
17 virtually all of the peer-reviewed social science evidence is
18 that it does not happen in anything other than the most
19 minuscule quantities. Actually, can I talk about my article?

20 Q Sure. I was going to ask you about it later, but why don't
21 you go ahead.

22 A So there have been a variety of investigations looking at
23 prosecutions, looking at investigations, looking at forensic
24 evidence of voting irregularities, and there are a variety of
25 ways that it can be detected. But I and two colleagues, one who

1 is a political scientist now at the University of California-San
2 Diego and another who is a professor of political science at
3 Stanford, we conducted what is called a list experiment, and
4 this is a technique that is -- that has been shown to capture
5 evidence of illegal or stigmatizing activity through surveys.

6 The difficulty is that if you ask someone if they have done
7 something illegal or stigmatizing, you ask people if they have
8 committed vote fraud, people will say no, and so it's not the
9 sort of thing that will be picked up. However, there are
10 techniques, and this is a technique that has actually been
11 demonstrated as being able to measure things like not only
12 stigmatizing activity but actually has been able to detect
13 political corruption. It's called the list experiment, and the
14 way that it works is we present a group of respondents, people
15 in a survey -- this was an online survey -- we present them with
16 a list of activities, say five activities, some of which are
17 innocuous, some of which are still innocuous but have lower
18 probability.

19 So we present people with the list of five activities
20 related to politics, and we ask them, how many of these things
21 have you done? We don't ask which ones. We say, how many of
22 these things have you done? And some of the options, I voted in
23 the last election. I contributed to a political candidate. I
24 attended a rally. I talked about politics with my friends. And
25 it gives us an estimate of how many things people have done.

1 And then for the treatment group we present people with the
2 same list, but we add the activity that we're actually trying to
3 test for. So in this case it was I voted in someone else's name
4 in a recent election, and we don't ask them how many -- don't
5 ask them which of these things have you done. We ask people how
6 many, and you can compare the number -- the average number in
7 the treatment and the control group to see if there's a
8 difference, and if there's a difference, it suggests that the
9 treatment question is picking up people who are picking that
10 option because all the other five options are the same.

11 And so we did this, and we found that there was no
12 difference. In fact, the average number of people in the
13 treatment group is actually a little bit lower, as I recall. So
14 based on this technique, there was no difference. There was no
15 detectable levels of voter impersonation. However, we did have
16 a small number of respondents who said that they had done all of
17 these things, which would indicate, well, if that's true, that
18 suggests that they actually do -- they have committed vote
19 fraud. We had reason to believe that's not what happened
20 because this was an online survey, and we could actually track
21 how long people took in each question, and so there were people
22 who went through and basically clicked the same answer in all to
23 get their \$3 from Survey Monkey or whatever they got for
24 completing the survey.

25 And so we had reason to believe that this was not a real

1 thing, but we wanted to be sure. And so we conducted a
2 second -- actually two other list experiments. One was a list
3 experiment that was actually looking for evidence of a
4 stigmatizing activity. So we did an experiment where the
5 treatment -- it was five innocuous activities. I floss my
6 teeth. I received a phone call from a telemarketer and so
7 forth, and then for the treatment group --

8 Q Everybody lies about the flossing question.

9 A Everybody lies about the flossing. The treatment was, I
10 text while I drive, which is illegal in a lot of states,
11 stigmatizing. We actually found that basically 25 percent of
12 people in the survey admit to texting while driving, which is
13 actually consistent with data that you see from the National
14 Highway Traffic Safety Administration, the National Insurance --
15 whatever the group does that does the crash tests. So we were
16 confident that we actually were picking up stigmatizing
17 activity.

18 The second additional list experiment is that we asked for
19 five innocuous activities, but the treatment was, I have been
20 kidnapped by aliens, which we took as a phenomena that does not
21 happen. And we found that there are actually more people who
22 say that -- there's more evidence that people have been
23 kidnapped by aliens than there is of voter impersonation. So
24 all these things taken together is just an additional piece of
25 evidence which is consistent with all the other good evidence

1 that levels of -- that there is no material amount of voter
2 impersonation.

3 Q Or there's a lot more alien abductions.

4 A As we put it in the article, if that's true, we have much
5 bigger problems.

6 THE COURT: That's probably a good breaking point for
7 us. We might as well keep going until midnight, but we have to
8 have a court reporter who remains conscious through the whole
9 time. So we'll call it a night here. I forgot to check my
10 calendar for tomorrow so that I can give you a heads-up of what
11 we're facing tomorrow. Is my calendar up over there?

12 THE CLERK: Not yet. You have an 11:00 sentencing.

13 THE COURT: All right. So -- all right. So we'll
14 start at our usual 8:00 time. I have got the 11:00 sentencing,
15 so it's kind of sort of an early lunch. So we'll have to take a
16 break from 11:00 until 12:30, so we will resume at 12:30. Early
17 lunch. I promised this before and didn't really make good on
18 it, but since that's a long afternoon session, we'll probably
19 try to work in two afternoon breaks. That's our trajectory for
20 tomorrow. I will see you tomorrow at 8:00.

21 MR. SPIVA: Thank you.

22 MS. WILSON: Thank you, Your Honor.

23 (Proceedings concluded at 6:05 p.m.)

24 ***

25

1 I, JENNIFER L. DOBBRATZ, Certified Realtime and Merit
2 Reporter in and for the State of Wisconsin, certify that the
3 foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings held
4 on the 18th day of May, 2016, before the Honorable James D.
5 Peterson, U.S. District Judge for the Western District of
6 Wisconsin, in my presence and reduced to writing in accordance
7 with my stenographic notes made at said time and place.

8 Dated this 1st day of June, 2016.
9
10
11
12
13

14 /s/ Jennifer L. Dobbratz

15 Jennifer L. Dobbratz, RMR, CRR, CRC
16 Federal Court Reporter
17
18
19
20

21 The foregoing certification of this transcript does not apply to
22 any reproduction of the same by any means unless under the
23 direct control and/or direction of the certifying reporter.
24
25